

On open normal subgroups of parahorics

François Courtès

*Université de Poitiers
Département de Mathématiques
UMR 6086 du CNRS
Téléport 2
Boulevard Marie et Pierre Curie
86962 Futuroscope Chasseneuil Cedex*

Abstract

Let F be a local complete field with discrete valuation, and let G be a quasi-split group over F which splits over some unramified extension of F . Let P be a parahoric subgroup of the group $G(F)$ of F -points of G ; the open normal pro-nilpotent subgroups of P can be classified using the standard normal filtration subgroups of Prasad and Raghathan. More precisely, we show that if G is quasi-simple and satisfies some additional conditions, H is, modulo a subgroup of some maximal torus of G , either one of these filtration subgroups or the product of one of them by a standard normal filtration subgroup of $P \cap M$, where M is a proper Levi subgroup of G .

Key words: Reductive groups over local fields, parahoric subgroups, normal subgroups

1991 MSC: 20G25, 20E07

1 Introduction

Let F be a local complete field with discrete valuation; let $\mathcal{O}$ be its ring of integers, $\mathfrak{p}$ the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}$, $K = \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}$ its residual field. Let ϖ be a uniformizer of F , and v_F be the normalized valuation on F .

Let G be a connected reductive algebraic group defined over F ; we'll assume G is quasisplit, and splits over some unramified extension of F ; let $G(F)$ be the set of F -points of G . Let Φ be the root system of $G(F)$ relatively to some maximal split torus S of G ; we'll assume that Φ satisfies the following condition:

(G1): if the characteristic p of K is 2, Φ is simply-laced; if $p = 3$, Φ has no connected component of type G_2 .

Let G^0 be the parahoric component of $G(F)$, that is the subgroup of $G(F)$ generated by all parahoric subgroups of $G(F)$. G^0 is an open normal subgroup of $G(F)$, and the quotient $G(F)/G^0$ is abelian; moreover, $G(F)/G^0$ is finite if and only if G is semisimple, and $G^0 = G(F)$ if and only if G is simply-connected.

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the Bruhat-Tits building of $G(F)$, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be the apartment of $\mathcal{B}$ associated to S ; $\mathcal{A}$ is isomorphic as a $\mathbb{R}$ -affine space to $(X_*(S) \otimes \mathbb{R}) / (X_*(Z) \otimes \mathbb{R})$, where Z is the split component of the center of G and $X_*(S), X_*(Z)$ are the groups of cocharacters of S, Z . The subgroup Q of the group $X^*(S)$ of characters of S generated by Φ can then be viewed as a group of affine functions on $\mathcal{A}$, by the standard duality product.

For every $x \in \mathbb{B}$ and every $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$, let $B(x, r)$ be the subset of elements y of $\mathcal{B}$ satisfying the following property: for every apartment $\mathcal{A}'$ containing both x and y and every root α of G relatively to S' , S' being the maximal split torus associated to $\mathcal{A}'$, we have $\alpha(y) - \alpha(x) \leq r$. Since $B(x, r)$ is nonempty, the subgroup $G_{x,r}$ of elements of G^0 fixing $B(x, r)$ pointwise is an open bounded subgroup of $G(F)$. Moreover, if G_x is the parahoric subgroup of $G(F)$ fixing x , $G_{x,r}$ is normal in G_x , and $G_{x,s} \subset G_{x,r}$ for $s > r$. We'll also write:

$$G_{x,r}^+ = \bigcup_{s>r} G_{x,s};$$

the group $G_{x,r}^+$ is also normal in G_x . Note that since the valuation is discrete, we have $G_{x,r}^+ = G_{x,s}$ for any $s > r$ sufficiently close to r .

These groups were first introduced in [7] and have been used in [5] and [6] to classify unramified types, in the context of p -adic fields, that is fields with finite residual fields. They constitute a standard filtration of parahoric subgroups of $G(F)$ by open normal subgroups, in the following sense: let A be a facet of $\mathcal{B}$, and P_A be the parahoric subgroup of G fixing A pointwise. Then for every $x \in A$, $G_{x,0} = G_x = P_A$, and the $G_{x,r}$, with $x \in A$ and $r \geq 0$, are a basis of neighborhoods of unity. Moreover, for every $x \in A$, $G_{x,0}/G_{x,0}^+$ is the group of K -points of a reductive K -group (which depends only on A), and for every $r > 0$, $G_{x,r}/G_{x,r}^+$ is abelian.

We can consider the concave function f on Φ defined by $f(\alpha) = \alpha(x) + r$ for every $\alpha \in \Phi$. Let $U_{x,r} = U_{G_{x,r}}$ be the subgroup U_f of $G(F)$ attached to f as in [2, I.6.4]; $U_{x,r}$ is a normal subgroup of G_x , and there exists a subgroup T' of $T(F)$, where T is the centralizer of S in G , such that $G_{x,r} = T'U_{x,r}$. (For given x, r , the subgroups $T''U_{x,r}$, with $T'' \subset T(F)$, which are normal in G_x may be classified with the help of [2, I.6.4.19].)

One can naturally ask if these subgroups, for $r > 0$, exhaust the open normal pro-nilpotent subgroups of G_x , at least when G is quasi-simple. The answer is in general no, but they can still be used to classify them.

First we'll show that to every open bounded subgroup H of G normalized by the unique parahoric subgroup P_T of $T(F)$, we can attach a concave function f_H on Φ . More precisely, we have the following result:

Proposition 1.1 *Assume Φ satisfies (G1), and:*

- *either $p \neq 2$ or F is absolutely unramified;*
- *K has at least 4 elements, and if K has exactly 4 (resp. 5) elements, Φ has no component of type A_2 (resp. A_1 , C_n or BC_n).*

Let H be an open bounded pro-nilpotent subgroup of $G(F)$ normalized by P_T ; there exists a bounded subgroup T' of $T(F)$ and a concave function f_H on Φ such that $H = T'U_{f_H}$.

Since every parahoric subgroup of $G(F)$ contains the parahoric subgroup of some maximal torus of $G(F)$, this will in particular be true for open normal subgroups of G_x .

We then consider more precisely the concave functions attached to the open normal pro-nilpotent subgroups of parahorics; and more particularly of some given Iwahori subgroup I of $G(F)$; we will in fact study the function $f_\varepsilon = f - f_I$. By establishing some properties of the elements of a given class of subsets of Φ , which will be called Δ' -complete subsets, where Δ' is the extended basis of Φ associated to I , we will then determine $r \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ and $x \in \mathcal{A}$ which will satisfy the main result of the paper:

Theorem 1.2 *Assume G is quasi-simple and the conditions of the previous proposition are satisfied. Let A be a facet of $\mathcal{B}$, $\overline{A}$ be the closure of A and G_A be the parahoric subgroup of G fixing A ; let H be any open normal pro-nilpotent subgroup of G_A . There exists $x \in \overline{A}$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ such that H satisfies one of the following conditions:*

- $U_{x,r} \subset H \subset G_{x,r}$;
- *there exists $r' > r$ and a proper Levi subgroup M of G containing $T(F)$ and such that $U_{x,r'}U_{M,x,r} \subset H \subset G_{x,r'}M_{x,r}$.*

We conclude with an easy generalization of our main result to non-quasi-simple groups.

2 Generalities

2.1 A few miscellaneous notations

Let F' be a valued field with discrete valuation; we denote by $v_{F'}$ the normalized valuation on F' , that is the unique valuation whose image is precisely $\mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\}$. If E is any extension of F' , we'll denote again by $v_{F'}$ the valuation on E whose restriction to F' is $v_{F'}$.

Let H be a group and H' be a subgroup of H ; we'll write $N_H(H')$ (resp. $Z_H(H')$) for the normalizer (resp. the centralizer) of H' in H .

For every $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we'll write $\text{floor}(r)$ (resp. $\text{ceil}(r)$) for the largest integer $\leq r$ (resp. the smallest integer $\geq r$).

2.2 More about roots and affine roots

This section is devoted to some results about root systems which will be useful later. (For the basic results about root systems, see [1]).

Let V be a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{R}$ -vector space, and let Φ be a root system contained in V . We'll assume in this subsection that Φ is irreducible.

We'll denote by W the Weyl group of Φ . Let $(\cdot, \cdot)$ be a W -invariant scalar product on V ; we'll assume $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is chosen such that:

- if Φ is simply-laced, $(\alpha, \alpha) = 2$ for every $\alpha \in \Phi$;
- if Φ is not simply-laced, $(\alpha, \alpha) = 2$ if α is a long root in Φ .

If Φ is reduced, we'll write $h(\Phi)$ for the Coxeter number of Φ . If Φ is of type BC_n , we'll set $h(\Phi) = 2n + 1$, that is the Coxeter number of Φ plus one.

Let Φ_{aff} be the affine root system associated to Φ , which will be identified with the subset $\Phi \times \mathbb{Z}$ of $X^*(S) \times \mathbb{Z}$. We'll denote by W_{aff} the affine Weyl group of Φ_{aff} .

Let Δ be a basis of Φ , and let Δ' be the extended basis $\Delta \cup \{-\alpha_M\}$ of Φ , where α_M is the largest root of Φ w.r.t Δ . Set:

$$\Delta_{aff} = \{(\alpha, 0) | \alpha \in \Delta\} \cup \{(-\alpha_M, 1)\};$$

Δ_{aff} is a basis of Φ_{aff} .

Let Φ^+ (resp. Φ_{aff}^+) be the set of positive elements of Φ (resp. Φ_{aff}) w.r.t Δ (resp. Δ_{aff}); Φ_{aff}^+ is the set of elements (α, v) in Φ_{aff} such that $v \geq 0$ if $\alpha \in \Phi^+$ and $v \geq 1$ else. It is well-known (see for example [7, 2]) that every element of Φ_{aff}^+ can be uniquely written as a linear combination with nonnegative integer coefficients of elements of Δ_{aff} ; we deduce from this the following result:

Proposition 2.1 *Every element α of Φ can be written as a linear combination with nonnegative integer coefficients of elements of Δ' ; moreover, there is an unique such combination satisfying the following condition: the sum of the coefficients is strictly smaller than $h(\Phi)$.*

Consider the projection on Φ of the decomposition of $(\alpha, v) \in \Phi_{aff}^+$ for any suitable v ; the unique combination satisfying the last condition is the one obtained with $v = 0$ (resp. $v = 1$) if $\alpha > 0$ (resp. $\alpha < 0$). $\square$

We'll call the height of (α, v) (resp. α) relatively to Δ_{aff} (resp. Δ') and we'll write $h(\alpha, v)$ (resp. $h(\alpha)$) for the sum of the coefficients of (α, v) (resp. α) defined as above.

For every $\alpha \in \Phi$, let ε_α be the smallest integer such that $(\alpha, \varepsilon_\alpha) \in \Phi_{aff}^+$, that is $\varepsilon_\alpha = 0$ if $\alpha > 0$, $\varepsilon_\alpha = 1$ if $\alpha < 0$. The following results are immediate:

- if $(\alpha, u), (\beta, v)$ are elements of Φ_{aff}^+ such that $(\alpha + \beta, u + v) \in \Phi_{aff}$, then $h(\alpha + \beta, u + v) = h(\alpha, u) + h(\beta, v)$;
- for every $\alpha \in \Phi$, $h(-\alpha, \varepsilon_{-\alpha}) = h(\Phi) - h(\alpha, \varepsilon_\alpha)$.

We obtain the following corresponding assertions about elements of Φ :

- if α, β are elements of Φ such that $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$, then $h(\alpha + \beta) \equiv h(\alpha) + h(\beta)$ modulo $h(\Phi)$;
- for every $\alpha \in \Phi$, $h(-\alpha) = h(\Phi) - h(\alpha)$.

In particular, for every $\alpha \in \Phi$, we have $h(\alpha) \in \{1, \dots, h(\Phi) - 1\}$.

We can define a partial order on Φ_{aff}^+ relatively to Δ_{aff} as follows: for every $(\alpha, u), (\beta, v) \in \Phi$, we have $\alpha \leq \beta$ if all the coefficients of elements of Δ_{aff} in the decomposition of (α, u) are smaller than or equal to the corresponding ones in the decomposition of (β, v) . In particular, if $u < v$, we have $(\alpha, u + \varepsilon_\alpha) < (\beta, v + \varepsilon_\beta)$ for every $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$.

We deduce from this order a partial order on Φ as follows: $\alpha \leq \beta$ if and only if $(\alpha, v + \varepsilon_\alpha) \leq (\beta, v + \varepsilon_\beta)$ for every v . This partial order is different from the usual one relative to Δ , but it is easy to see that the restrictions of both orders to the subset of positive (resp. negative) elements are the same; the minimal elements (resp. the maximal elements) of our order are the elements of Δ' (resp. $-\Delta'$), and we easily see that $\alpha \leq \beta$ implies $-\beta \leq -\alpha$. In the

sequel, unless another order on Φ is explicitly mentioned, we will always refer to this one.

We have the following results:

Proposition 2.2 *Let α, β be two elements of Φ such that $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$; if $h(\alpha + \beta) = h(\alpha) + h(\beta)$ (resp. if $h(\alpha + \beta) = h(\alpha) + h(\beta) - h(\Phi)$), then $\alpha + \beta$ is greater (resp. lesser) than both α and β .*

The first assertion is obvious. The second one is obtained by simply remarking that if $h(\alpha + \beta) = h(\alpha) + h(\beta) - h(\Phi)$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} h(-\alpha - \beta) &= h(\Phi) - h(\alpha + \beta) \\ &= 2h(\Phi) - h(\alpha) - h(\beta) = h(-\alpha) + h(-\beta). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 2.3 *Let α, β be elements of Φ ; we have $\alpha \leq \beta$ if and only if there exist elements $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_t$ of Δ' such that:*

- for every $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, $\alpha_i = \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^i \gamma_j$ is an element of Φ ;
- $\alpha_t = \beta$.

Assume $\alpha \leq \beta$; we'll show the existence of the γ_i . Write $\beta = \alpha + \sum_{i=1}^t \delta_i$, with $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_t \in \Delta'$. If $t = 0$, there is nothing to prove; suppose $t > 0$. Since $(\beta, \beta) > 0$, we have either $(\beta, \delta_i) > 0$ for some i or $(\beta, \alpha) > 0$. In the first case, set $\gamma_t = \delta_i$; the result follows from the induction hypothesis applied to α and $\beta - \delta_i$. In the second case, $\beta - \alpha$ is a root. If $(\alpha, \delta_i) < 0$ for some i , we can set $\gamma_1 = \delta_i$ and conclude by the induction hypothesis applied to $\alpha + \delta_i$ and β ; if there is no such i , we are in one of the following two cases:

- Φ is of type B_n, C_n or F_4 , and α and $\beta - \alpha$ are orthogonal but not strongly orthogonal;
- Φ is of type G_2 , and α and $\beta - \alpha$ are short roots such that $(\alpha, \beta) = 1$.

In both cases, β is a long root; the result is then true for $-\beta$ and $-\alpha$, which obviously implies the result for α and β .

Conversely, assume the γ_i do exist. By an easy induction we may assume $t = 1$; we then have either $h(\beta) = h(\alpha) + 1$ or $h(\beta) = h(\alpha) - h(\Phi) + 1$; since the length of any element of Φ is contained in $\{1, \dots, h(\Phi) - 1\}$, the second case is impossible and we obtain $\alpha \leq \beta$, as required. □

Let $\overline{\Phi}$ be the subset $\Phi \cup \{0\}$ of $X^*(T)$. Let α, β be two elements of $\overline{\Phi}$; it is

easy, with the help of [1, 1.3, cor. to th. 1], to check that we always have:

- if $(\alpha, \beta) < 0$, then $\alpha + \beta \in \overline{\Phi}$;
- if $(\alpha, \beta) > 0$, then $\alpha - \beta \in \overline{\Phi}$.

Set also $\overline{\Phi_{aff}} = \overline{\Phi} \times \mathbb{Z}$. For every $v > 0$, $(0, v) \in \overline{\Phi_{aff}}$ can also be uniquely written as a linear combination with nonnegative integer coefficients of elements of Δ_{aff} ; moreover, we have $h(0, v) = h(\Phi)v$, and the partial order on Φ_{aff}^+ extends canonically to $\overline{\Phi_{aff}^+} = \Phi_{aff}^+ \cup (\{0\} \times \mathbb{N}^*)$ by setting $(\alpha, v - 1 + \varepsilon_\alpha) \leq (0, v) \leq (\beta, v + \varepsilon_\beta)$ for every α, β .

Proposition 2.4 *Let $(\alpha_1, c_1 + \varepsilon_{\alpha_1}), \dots, (\alpha_t, c_t + \varepsilon_{\alpha_t})$ be elements of Φ_{aff}^+ whose sum is also an element $(\alpha, c + \varepsilon_\alpha)$ of Φ_{aff}^+ . Let $\beta \in \overline{\Phi}$ and $c' \in \{c, c+1\}$ be such that $(\alpha, c + \varepsilon_\alpha) \leq (\beta, c' + \varepsilon_\beta) \leq (0, c+1)$ (resp. $(0, c) \leq (\beta, c' + \varepsilon_\beta) \leq (\alpha, c + \varepsilon_\alpha)$); there exist then elements $(\beta_1, c'_1 + \varepsilon_{\beta_1}), \dots, (\beta_t, c'_t + \varepsilon_{\beta_t})$ of $\overline{\Phi_{aff}^+}$ whose sum is $(\beta, c + \varepsilon_\beta)$ and such that $(\alpha_i, c_i + \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) \leq (\beta_i, c'_i + \varepsilon_{\beta_i}) \leq (0, c_i + 1)$ (resp. $(0, c_i) \leq (\beta_i, c'_i + \varepsilon_{\beta_i}) \leq (\alpha_i, c_i + \varepsilon_{\alpha_i})$) for every i .*

We'll show the proposition with $(\alpha, c + \varepsilon_\alpha) \leq (\beta, c' + \varepsilon_\beta) \leq (0, c+1)$, the proof for $(0, c) \leq (\beta, c' + \varepsilon_\beta) \leq (\alpha, c + \varepsilon_\alpha)$ being similar. With the previous proposition and an easy induction, we can assume there exists $\gamma \in \Delta'$ such that $\beta = \alpha + \gamma$, hence $(\beta, c' + \varepsilon_\beta) = (\alpha, c + \varepsilon_\alpha) + (\gamma, \varepsilon_\gamma)$. If $(\alpha_i, \gamma) < 0$ for some i , then $\alpha_i + \gamma \in \Phi$, and since $(\beta_i, c'_i + \varepsilon_{\beta_i}) = (\alpha_i, c_i + \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) + (\gamma, \varepsilon_\gamma) > (\alpha_i, c_i + \varepsilon_{\alpha_i})$, setting $(\beta_j, c'_j + \varepsilon_{\beta_j}) = (\alpha_j, c_j + \varepsilon_{\alpha_j})$ for every $j \neq i$ proves the proposition. Suppose now $(\alpha_i, \gamma) \geq 0$ for every i . Since $(\alpha, \alpha) > 0$, there exists an i such that $(\alpha, \alpha_i) > 0$, hence $\alpha - \alpha_i \in \overline{\Phi}$. If $\alpha = \alpha_i$, then $\alpha_i + \gamma \in \Phi$ and we conclude as before; we may then suppose $\alpha - \alpha_i \neq 0$.

Since $(\alpha, \alpha_i) > 0$ and $(\gamma, \alpha_i) \geq 0$, we have $(\beta, \alpha_i) = (\alpha + \gamma, \alpha_i) > 0$, hence $\beta - \alpha_i \in \overline{\Phi}$. Moreover, setting $(\alpha', d + \varepsilon_{\alpha'}) = (\alpha, c + \varepsilon_\alpha) - (\alpha_i, c_i + \varepsilon_{\alpha_i})$ and $(\beta', d' + \varepsilon_{\beta'}) = (\beta, c' + \varepsilon_\beta) - (\alpha_i, c_i + \varepsilon_{\alpha_i})$, we must have either $d = d'$ or $\beta' = 0$, since $d < d'$ and $\beta' \neq 0$ would imply $h(\beta', d' + \varepsilon_{\beta'}) \geq h(\alpha', d + \varepsilon_{\alpha'}) + 2$, hence $h(\beta, c + \varepsilon_\beta) \geq h(\alpha, c + \varepsilon_\alpha) + 2$, which contradicts our assumptions; we then have $(\alpha', d + \varepsilon_{\alpha'}) \leq (\beta', d' + \varepsilon_{\beta'}) \leq (0, d+1)$. This way, we can show the result by induction on t ; since the case $t = 1$ is trivial, the proposition is proved. $\square$

2.3 Valuations

From now on, we'll assume Φ is the root system of G relatively to some maximal split torus S of G . We will denote by T the centralizer of S in G ; since G is quasisplit, T is a maximal torus of G , which splits over the same unramified extension of F as G .

For every $\alpha \in \Phi$, let U_α be the root subgroup of G associated to α . If 2α is

not a root, there exists a finite unramified extension F_α of F such that the group $U_\alpha(F)$ is isomorphic to F_α ; for every $x \in F_\alpha$, we'll write $u_\alpha(x)$ for the image of x in $U_\alpha(F)$ by some given isomorphism. If $2\alpha \in \Phi$, there exists a quadratic unramified extension F_α of $F_{2\alpha}$ such that $U_\alpha(F)$ is isomorphic to the semidirect product H_α of F_α by $F_{2\alpha}$, with the addition law defined as follows:

$$(x, y) + (x', y') = (x + x', y + y' + x\sigma(x)),$$

when σ is the nontrivial element of $\text{Gal}(F_\alpha/F_{2\alpha})$; moreover, the image of $\{(0, y) | y \in F_{2\alpha}\}$ is $U_{2\alpha}(F)$. Let's choose such an isomorphism; for every $x \in F_\alpha$, we'll set $u_\alpha(x)$ to be the image of $(x, 0)$ by that isomorphism.

For every α , we'll write $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$ for the ring of integers of F_α , $\mathfrak{p}_\alpha$ for the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$, K_α for the residual field of F_α .

Let $(v_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi}$ be a valuation on $(T, (U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi})$; for every α , v_α is an application from $U_\alpha(F)$ to $\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ satisfying the following conditions:

- for every $\alpha \in \Phi$, there exist constants $b_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, $c_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $x \in F_\alpha$, $v_\alpha(u_\alpha(x)) = b_\alpha v_F(x) + c_\alpha$;
- if $2\alpha \in \Phi$, for every $(x, y) \in H_\alpha$, if u is the image of (x, y) in $U_\alpha(F)$, $v_\alpha(u) = \inf(v_\alpha(x, 0), \frac{1}{2}v_{2\alpha}(0, y))$;
- the commutator relations: for every $\alpha \in \Phi$ and every $r \in \mathbb{R}$, let $U_{\alpha, r}$ be the subgroup of elements u of $U_\alpha(F)$ such that $v_\alpha(u) \geq r$. If α, β are elements of Φ such that $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$, and if r, r' are elements of $\mathbb{R}$, the commutator subgroup $[U_{\alpha, r}, U_{\beta, r'}]$ is contained in $U_{\alpha+\beta, r+r'}$; (and by [3] and [2, Appendix A], if (G1) is satisfied, this inclusion is an equality when $r \in \text{Im}(v_\alpha)$ and $r' \in \text{Im}(v_\beta)$);
- for every $\alpha \in \Phi$, if $u \in U_\alpha(F)$ and $u' \in U_{-\alpha}(F)$ generate a subgroup of G which is bounded but not pro-solvable, then $v_\alpha(u) + v_{-\alpha}(u') = 0$.

This is a rewriting of [2, I, definition 6.2.1] in our context (with a discrete valuation and a group which splits over an unramified extension).

We will also define a valuation on $T(F)$ the following way: for each $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the group T_r as the subgroup of elements $t \in T(F)$ such that for every $\alpha \in \Phi$ and every $r' \in \mathbb{R}$, we have:

$$[t, U_{\alpha, r'}] \subset U_{\alpha, r+r'}.$$

For every $t \in T(F)$, we'll set $v_0(t) = r$ if t belongs to T_r but not to any $T_{r'}$, $r' > r$. It is easy to see that adding v_0 to the family $(v_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi}$ leads to an extension of the valuation in the sense of [2, I.6.4.38].

We can even define valuations on bounded subgroups of $G(F)$. For every $\alpha \in \Phi$, set $U'_\alpha = U_\alpha(F)$ if $2\alpha \notin \Phi$, and if $2\alpha \in \Phi$, let U'_α be the image of the application u_α (which is not necessarily a subgroup of $U_\alpha(F)$); set $U'_{\alpha,r} = U_{\alpha,r} \cap U'_\alpha$ for every $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Let $G(F)_r$ be, for a given r , the subgroup of $G(F)$ generated by T_r and the $U'_{\alpha,r}$, $\alpha \in \Phi$; we'll also write $G(F)_r^+$ for the union of all the $G(F)_{r'}$, $r' > r$. The group $G(F)_0$ is a parahoric subgroup of $G(F)$, and $G(F)_0^+$ is its pro-nilpotent radical; moreover, the groups $G(F)_r$ and $G(F)_r^+$ are normal subgroups of G .

Of course, these groups depend on the chosen valuation. In fact, we can even show that we can attach to any valuation a point x of the apartment $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{B}$ associated to T , and conversely, in such a way that $G(F)_r = G_{x,r}$ for every r , but we will not use this fact; we will only use the following property (see [2, I.7.2]): for every parahoric subgroup H of $G(F)$ containing the parahoric subgroup P_T of $T(F)$, there exists a valuation such that $H = G(F)_0$, which implies by [2, I.3.3.1] that every bounded subgroup of $G(F)$ is contained in the group $G(F)_0$ relative to some valuation.

For every $g \in G(F)_0$, we'll set $v_G(g) = r$ if g belongs to $G(F)_r$ but not to $G(F)_r^+$.

For convenience, we'll write $U_0 = T$, and $U_{0,r} = T_r$ for every r . The following result follows immediately from the definitions:

Proposition 2.5 *Let α be any element of $\overline{\Phi}$, and let u be any element of $U'_\alpha \cap G(F)_0$. Then $v_G(u) = v_\alpha(u)$.*

2.4 Concave functions

From now on and until the end of the paper, we'll assume Φ satisfies (G1). Moreover, in this subsection, we'll also assume Φ is connected.

Let f be a map from Φ to $\mathbb{R}$; f is said to be concave if it satisfies the following conditions:

- for each $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$ such that $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$, $f(\alpha + \beta) \leq f(\alpha) + f(\beta)$;
- for every $\alpha \in \Phi$, $f(\alpha) + f(-\alpha) \geq 0$.

Let U_f be the subgroup of G generated by the $U_{\alpha,f(\alpha)}$, $\alpha \in \Phi$. The following properties are well-known (see [2, I.6.4]):

- if f is concave, then for every $\alpha \in \Phi$, $U_f \cap U_\alpha(F)$ is equal to $U_{\alpha,f(\alpha)}$ if $2\alpha \notin \Phi$, to $U_{\alpha,f(\alpha)}U_{2\alpha,f(2\alpha)}$ if $2\alpha \in \Phi$;
- since Φ satisfies (G1), the converse is true if f is optimal (i.e. if for every

$$\alpha \in \Phi, f(\alpha) \in \text{Im}(v_\alpha)).$$

Moreover, if f is concave and for every $\alpha \in \Phi$, $f(\alpha) + f(-\alpha) > 0$, we deduce immediately from [2, I.6.4.10] that U_f is pro-solvable and that we have:

$$U_f = (T \cap U_f) \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi} (U_\alpha(F) \cap U_f)$$

the product being taken in any order. Conversely, for any pro-solvable subgroup H of G satisfying the above condition and such that for every $\alpha \in \Phi$, $U_\alpha(F) \cap H = U_{\alpha, f_\alpha}$ for some f_α , if moreover f_α is maximal among the elements of $\mathbb{R}$ satisfying that property, then the map $f_H : \alpha \mapsto f_\alpha$ is concave and optimal, we have $f_H(\alpha) + f_H(-\alpha) > 0$ for every $\alpha \in \Phi$, and there exists a subgroup T' of $T(F)$ such that $H = T'U_{f_H}$.

Assume now the valuation has been chosen in such a way that for every α , $v_\alpha(U'_\alpha) = c_\alpha + \mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\}$ for some constant c_α ; since G splits over an unramified extension of F , this is always possible.

Proposition 2.6 *Let f be a concave function; the group $P_f = P_T U_f$ is contained in a maximal parahoric subgroup. Moreover, if f is optimal and for every $\alpha \in \Phi$, we have $f(\alpha) + f(-\alpha) \leq 1$ (resp. $f(\alpha) + f(-\alpha) = 1$), P_f is a parahoric subgroup (resp. an Iwahori subgroup) of $G(F)$.*

According to [2, I.6.4.9], P_f is the finite union of the cosets:

$$P_T \left(\prod_{\alpha \in \Phi} U_{\alpha, f(\alpha)} \right) n,$$

where n belongs to a system of representatives of $(N_G(T(F)) \cap P_f)/P_T$; we deduce then immediately from the definitions ([2, I.3.1.1 and I.8.1.1]) that P_f is bounded; according to [2, I.3.3.3], there exists a maximal parahoric subgroup P of G containing P_f . Let P_f^+ be its pro-nilpotent radical; since P contains P_T , there exists a concave function f_P on Φ such that $P = P_{f_P}$; moreover, we have $P^+ = U_{f'_P}$, where f'_P is the concave function on Φ defined by $f'_P(\alpha) = 1 - f_P(-\alpha)$. Since P_f is contained in P , we have $f(\alpha) \geq f_P(\alpha)$ for every α , which implies:

$$f(\alpha) \leq 1 - f(-\alpha) \leq 1 - f_P(-\alpha) = f'_P(\alpha)$$

for every α ; hence P^+ is contained in P_f . The group P_f/P^+ is therefore a closed subgroup of the reductive group P/P^+ containing the maximal torus P_T/P^+ ; moreover, if Φ_P is the root system of P/P^+ relatively to P_T/P^+ , viewed as the subsystem of elements $\alpha \in \Phi$ such that $f_P(\alpha) + f_P(-\alpha) = 0$, for every $\alpha \in \Phi_P$, we have $f'_P(\alpha) + f'_P(-\alpha) = 2$, hence either α or $-\alpha$ is a root of

P_f/P^+ relatively to P_T/P^+ ; moreover, we deduce easily from the commutator relations that the set of roots of P_f/P^+ is closed in Φ_P . This set is then a parabolic subset of Φ_P , and [1, 1.7. prop. 20] shows that P_f/P^+ is a parabolic subgroup of P/P^+ ; hence P_f is a parahoric subgroup of $G(F)$, as required.

Assume now $f(\alpha) + f(-\alpha) = 1$ for every $\alpha \in \Phi$. Then P_f is pro-solvable, and P_f/P^+ is solvable, hence is a Borel subgroup of P/P^+ ; P_f is then an Iwahori subgroup of $G(F)$, which shows the proposition. $\square$

3 Proof of the proposition 1.1

Assume now the conditions of the proposition 1.1 are satisfied. Let H be an open bounded pro-nilpotent subgroup of $G(F)$ normalized by P_T ; we'll show the existence of T' and f_H .

We'll first show some preliminary results.

Lemma 3.1 *It is possible to choose the valuation on $G(F)$ in such a way that H is contained in $P_T G(F)_0^+$.*

Since H is bounded, it is contained in some parahoric subgroup of G , hence the set E_H of points of $\mathcal{B}$ fixed by H is nonempty. Moreover, this set is bounded since H is open, and stable by the action of P_T ; hence by [2, I.3.2.4], there exists $x \in E_H$ such that x is fixed by P_T , which is tantamount to say that the parahoric subgroup G_x of $G(F)$ contains both H and P_T .

Moreover, since H is pro-solvable, the subgroup $H/H \cap G_{x,0}^+$ of the reductive group $G_x/G_{x,0}^+$ is a nilpotent subgroup normalized by the maximal torus $P_T/(P_T \cap G_{x,0}^+)$; it is then contained in the nilpotent radical of some Borel subgroup of $G_x/G_{x,0}^+$, hence H is contained in the pro-nilpotent radical I^+ of the corresponding Iwahori subgroup I of $G(F)$.

We may then assume $H = I^+$. We have $I = P_T U_{f_I}$, with f_I being a concave function on Φ such that $f_I(\alpha) + f_I(-\alpha) = 1$ for every $\alpha \in \Phi$. Let P_0 be a special parahoric subgroup containing I and P_1 be its pro-nilpotent radical, let Δ_0 be the basis of Φ associated to the Borel subgroup I/P_1 of P_0/P_1 ; assume the valuation on $G(F)$ has been chosen in such a way that we have $f_I(\alpha) = \frac{1}{h(\Phi)}$ for every α . Let β be any element of Φ ; if β is positive relatively to Δ_0 , we have $U_\beta(F) \cap I = U_\beta(F) \cap P_0$, and we obtain that $f_I(\beta) = \frac{h(\beta)}{h(\Phi)} > 0$ ($h(\beta)$ being taken relatively to Δ_0). If now $\beta < 0$, we have:

$$f_I(\beta) = 1 - f_I(-\beta) = \frac{h(\Phi) - h(\beta)}{h(\Phi)} > 0.$$

Since for every $\beta \in \Phi$, $f_I(\beta) > 0$, H is contained in $P_T G(F)_0^+$, as required. $\square$

For the sake of simplicity of notations, until the end of the proof of the proposition, we will assume $v_G(g) \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\}$ for every $g \in G(F)_0$; this can be done for example by multiplying the valuation previously considered by $h(\Phi)$.

Proposition 3.2 *Assume at least one of the following conditions is fulfilled:*

- K has at least 7 elements;
- K has 5 elements and Φ has no component of type A_1 , C_n or BC_n ;
- K has 4 elements and Φ has no component of type A_2 .

Let h be any element of H ; write:

$$h = \prod_{\alpha \in \overline{\Phi}} h_\alpha,$$

with $h_\alpha \in U'_\alpha$ for every $\alpha \in \overline{\Phi}$. Let $v = v_G(h)$; for every $\alpha \neq 0$ such that $v_\alpha(h_\alpha) = v$, $H \cap h_\alpha G_v^+$ is nonempty.

Let H_v (resp. H_v^+) be the subgroup of elements $h \in H$ such that $v(h) \geq v$ (resp. $v(h) > v$); H_v^+ is a normal subgroup of H_v , and since $v > 0$, the group H_v/H_v^+ is abelian, and is a subgroup of $G(F)_v/G(F)_v^+$, which is isomorphic to a direct product of copies of K ; moreover, H_v and H_v^+ are normalized by P_T , and if P_T^+ is the pro-nilpotent radical of P_T , we deduce from the commutator relations that we have:

$$[P_T^+, H_v] \subset H_v^+.$$

The torus $T(K)$ acts then on the abelian group H_v/H_v^+ . By a well-known result (see for example [4, I.2.11(3)]), H_v/H_v^+ is the direct sum of its $T(K)$ -weight subgroups; therefore, the assertion of the lemma is true as soon as all the elements of $\overline{\Phi}$ occuring as weights of H_v/H_v^+ are actually distinct characters of $T(K)$.

Let $\alpha \neq \beta$ be two elements of $\overline{\Phi}$; we'll show that $\alpha - \beta$ is nontrivial on $T(K)$. This is always the case if K is infinite; if K is finite and $q = \text{card}(K)$, this is true as soon as $\alpha - \beta \notin (q-1)X^*(S)$ (if and only if $\alpha - \beta \notin (q-1)X^*(S)$ when G is split).

Suppose first $\beta = 0$, and let $\alpha^\vee$ be the coroot associated to α ; since by definition $\langle \alpha, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 2$, α is nontrivial on $T(K)$ as soon as $q \geq 4$.

Suppose now $\beta = -\alpha$; by the same argument, $\alpha - \beta = 2\alpha$ is nontrivial on $T(K)$ as soon as either $q = 4$ or $q \geq 7$. Moreover, the case $\alpha \in 2X^*(T)$ occurs

only when Φ has components of type A_1 , C_n or BC_n ; in all other cases, there exists $\beta \in \Phi$ such that $\langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle = 1$, and 2α is nontrivial on $T(K)$ as soon as $q \geq 4$.

Suppose now $\beta = 2\alpha$; we have then $(2\alpha)^\vee = \frac{1}{2}\alpha^\vee$, and $\langle \alpha - \beta, (2\alpha)^\vee \rangle = 1$; $\alpha - \beta = -\alpha$ is then nontrivial on $T(K)$ as soon as $q \geq 3$. By the same reasoning, if $\beta = -2\alpha$, $\alpha - \beta = 3\alpha$ is nontrivial on $T(K)$ as soon as $q \geq 5$.

Suppose next α and β are orthogonal. Since $\langle \alpha - \beta, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 2$, $\alpha - \beta$ is nontrivial on $T(K)$ as soon as $q \geq 4$.

Suppose finally α and β are non-orthogonal and linearly independant. According to [8, 7.5.1], we then have either $\langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle = \pm 1$ or $\langle \beta, \alpha^\vee \rangle = \pm 1$. Assume for example $\langle \beta, \alpha^\vee \rangle = \pm 1$; we obtain $0 < \langle \alpha - \beta, \alpha^\vee \rangle \leq 3$, and $\alpha - \beta$ is nontrivial on $T(K)$ as soon as $q \geq 5$; moreover, if Φ is simply-laced and α and β don't belong to any component of type A_2 of Φ , there exists $\gamma \in \Phi$ such that $\langle \alpha - \beta, \gamma^\vee \rangle = 1$, and we can replace $q \geq 5$ by $q \geq 4$. (Remember that the case Φ not simply-laced and $q = 4$ is excluded by (G1).)

By summarizing the different cases, we get the assertion of the proposition. $\square$

Lemma 3.3 *Assume $p \neq 2$ or F is absolutely unramified. Let α be an element of Φ , let $v < v'$ be two integers such that there exists $h \in H$ such that $h = h_\alpha h_r$, with $h_\alpha \in U_\alpha(F)$, $v_\alpha(h_\alpha) = v$ and $v(h_r) \geq v'$. Then for any $h'_\alpha \in U_{\alpha,v}$, $H \cap h'_\alpha G_{v'}$ is nonempty.*

Assume first $2\alpha \notin \Phi$. Set $h_\alpha = u_\alpha(x)$, $x \in F_\alpha$; for each $t \in P_T$, we have $th_r t^{-1} \in G_{v'}$, and $u_\alpha(\alpha(t)x)(th_r t^{-1}) \in H$. If there exists $y \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha^*$ such that $t = \alpha^\vee(y)$, we obtain, setting $h'_r = th_r t^{-1} \in G_{v'}$:

$$u_\alpha(y^2 x) h'_r \in H$$

for each y . Let X be the subgroup of the elements b of $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$ such that $u_\alpha(b)G_{v'}$ meets H ; in order to show that $X = x\mathcal{O}_\alpha$, we only have to check that the ring $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$ is generated by the squares it contains.

Suppose first the characteristic p of K is odd or zero; we have:

$$z = \frac{1}{2}((z+1)^2 - z^2 - 1),$$

which proves the assertion since $\frac{1}{2} = 2(\frac{1}{2^2})$.

Suppose now $p = 2$. Since K_α is perfect, any element of K_α^* is a square; moreover, we have $2 = 1^2 + 1^2$. We then only have to show that every element of $1 + \mathfrak{p}_\alpha$ belongs to the subring of $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$ generated by the squares, which is simply

done by remarking that if $z \in 1 + \mathfrak{p}_\alpha$, since F_α is absolutely unramified, $\frac{z+1}{2}$ and $\frac{z-1}{2}$ belong to $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$ and $z = (\frac{z+1}{2})^2 - (\frac{z-1}{2})^2$.

(Remark: when $p = 2$, the result is false when F is absolutely ramified. It is easy to check for example that for $F = F_0[\sqrt{2}]$, where F_0 is any unramified extension of $\mathbb{Q}_2$, and $G = SL_2$, we can obtain counterexamples to the assertion of this lemma, and even to the proposition 1.1.)

Assume now $2\alpha \in \Phi$; since Φ is then not simply-laced, by (G1) we must have $p \neq 2$. By an explicit computation in SU_3 , we easily see that for an appropriate choice of the isomorphism between H_α and $U_\alpha(F)$, we have, setting again $t = \alpha^\vee(y)$:

$$tu_\alpha(x)t^{-1} = u_\alpha(y^2\sigma(y)^{-1}x),$$

with σ being the nontrivial element of $\text{Gal}(F_\alpha/F_{2\alpha})$. We claim that the elements $y^2\sigma(y)^{-1}$, $y \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha$; generate the ring $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$: for $y \in \mathcal{O}_{2\alpha}$, we simply have $y^2\sigma(y)^{-1} = y$, and for any $y \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha^*$ such that $\sigma(y) = -y$ (such an y exists because $F_\alpha/F_{2\alpha}$ is unramified and $p \neq 2$), we have $y^2\sigma(y)^{-1} = -y$. Since such an element and 1 generate $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$ as a $\mathcal{O}_{2\alpha}$ -module, the claim is proved.

On the other hand, we have:

$$[u_\alpha(x')U_{2\alpha,2c}G_{v'}, u_\alpha(x'')U_{2\alpha,2c}G_{v'}] \subset u_{2\alpha}(\sigma(x')x'' - x'\sigma(x''))G_{v'},$$

where σ is the nontrivial element of $\text{Gal}(F_\alpha/F_{2\alpha})$; moreover, if x', x'' are chosen such that the image of $\frac{x'}{x''}$ in K_α doesn't belong to K , the valuation of $\sigma(x')x'' - x'\sigma(x'')$ is exactly $2c$; since $2(2\alpha) \notin \Phi$, we deduce from the preceding case that for each $y \in \varpi^{2c}\mathcal{O}_{2\alpha}$, H meets $u_{2\alpha}(y)G_{v'}$. We combine these two assertions to obtain that H meets $h_\alpha G_{v'}$ for every $h_\alpha \in U_\alpha(F)$ such that $v_\alpha(h_\alpha) \geq c$, as required. $\square$

For every $\alpha \in \Phi$ and every positive elements $v \leq c$ of $\mathbb{Z}$, let $f_{\alpha,c,v}$ be the function on Φ such that $f_{\alpha,c,v}(\alpha) = v$, $f_{\alpha,c,v}(2\alpha) = v$ if $2\alpha \in \Phi$, and $f_{\alpha,c,v}(\beta) = c$ for every $\beta \neq \alpha, 2\alpha$.

Lemma 3.4 *The function $f_{\alpha,c,v}$ is a concave function; moreover, $U_{f_{\alpha,c+1,v+1}}$ is normal in $U_{f_{\alpha,c,v}}$ and the quotient $U_{f_{\alpha,c,v}}/U_{f_{\alpha,c+1,v+1}}$ is abelian.*

Let β, γ be two elements of ϕ such that $\beta + \gamma \in \phi$. If β and γ are both contained in $\{\alpha, 2\alpha\}$, then $\beta = \gamma = \alpha$ and $\beta + \gamma = 2\alpha$, and $f_{\alpha,c,v}(\beta + \gamma) = v \leq 2v = f_{\alpha,c,v}(\beta) + f_{\alpha,c,v}(\gamma)$; if now at least one of them is different from α and 2α , we have:

$$f_{\alpha,c,v}(\beta) + f_{\alpha,c,v}(\gamma) \geq c + v \geq c \geq f_{\alpha,c,v}(\beta + \gamma).$$

since it is obvious that $f_{\alpha,c,v}(\beta) + f_{\alpha,c,v}(-\beta) > 0$ for each $\beta \in \phi$, the concavity of $f_{\alpha,c,v}$ is proved; moreover, the above inequalities imply:

$$[U_{\alpha,f_{\alpha,c,v}(\alpha)}, U_{\alpha,f_{\alpha,c,v}(\alpha)}] \subset U_{2\alpha,2v} \subset U_{2\alpha,f_{\alpha,c+1,v+1}(2\alpha)}$$

if $2\alpha \in \phi$, and:

$$[U_{\beta,f_{\alpha,c,v}(\beta)}, U_{\gamma,f_{\alpha,c,v}(\gamma)}] \subset U_{\beta+\gamma,c+v} \subset U_{\beta+\gamma,f_{\alpha,c+1,v+1}(\beta+\gamma)}$$

for every $\beta, \gamma \in \phi$ such that $\beta + \gamma \in \phi$ and either β or γ doesn't belong to $\{\alpha, 2\alpha\}$; moreover, we have, for every $\beta \in \phi$:

$$[U_{\beta,f_{\alpha,c,v}(\beta)}, U_{0,c}] \subset U_{\beta,c+v} \subset U_{\beta,f_{\alpha,c+1,v+1}(\beta)}$$

and, since either β or $-\beta$ doesn't belong to $\{\alpha, 2\alpha\}$:

$$[U_{\beta,f_{\alpha,c,v}(\beta)}, U_{-\beta,f_{\alpha,c,v}(-\beta)}] \subset U_{0,c+v} \subset U_{0,c+1};$$

We deduce from all these inclusions that $U_{f_{\alpha,c+1,v+1}}$ is normal in $U_{f_{\alpha,c,v}}$ and that the quotient $U_{f_{\alpha,c,v}}/U_{f_{\alpha,c+1,v+1}}$ is abelian, as required. $\square$

Consider now the group $G(F)_{c,v} = U_{0,v}G(F)_c$; we have the following result:

Lemma 3.5 *The group $G(F)_{c+1,v+1}$ is normal in $G(F)_{c,v}$, and the quotient $G(F)_{c,v}/G(F)_{c+1,v+1}$ is abelian.*

The proof is analogous to the proof of the previous lemma. $\square$

Now we'll prove proposition 1.1. According to the remarks made in the previous section and to the lemma 3.3, we only have to show that we have:

$$H = \prod_{\alpha \in \overline{\Phi}} (H \cap U_{\alpha}(F)),$$

the product being taken in any order.

Let $h = \prod_{\alpha \in \overline{\Phi}} h_{\alpha}$ be defined as in the proposition 3.2, and set $v = v_G(h)$; assume moreover that the product is chosen according to some order on $\overline{\Phi}$ satisfying the following conditions:

- if α is any element of Φ , $0 \leq \alpha$;
- if α, β are elements of Φ , we have $\alpha < \beta$ if and only if $v(h_{\alpha}) > v(h_{\beta})$.

With the help of the commutator relations, it is easy to check that this is always possible.

Since H is open, there exists an integer c_0 such that $G_{c_0} \subset H$. We'll claim that for every $\alpha \in \overline{\Phi}$, H contains h_α . This may be done by proving that H contains elements of $h_\alpha G(F)_c$, with c arbitrarily large; since this will in particular be true for $c = c_0$, we will obtain that the element h_α itself belongs to H . We'll show the claim by induction on $c_0 - v$, the case $v = c_0$ being trivial.

First assume $\alpha \in \Phi$ and $v_\alpha(h_\alpha) = v$; we'll proceed by induction on c . The case $c = v + 1$ is simply the result of the proposition 3.2; assume now $c > v + 1$, and let h_{c-1} be an element of $h_\alpha G(F)_{c-1} \cap H$; such an element exists by the induction hypothesis. The element h_{c-1} belongs to $U_{f_{\alpha,c-1,v}}$; we deduce then from the lemma 3.4, by using as in the proof of proposition 3.2 the fact that the quotient $U_{f_{\alpha,c-1,v}}/U_{f_{\alpha,c,v+1}}$ can be viewed as a rational representation of $T(K)$, that $h_\alpha U_{f_{\alpha,c,v+1}} \cap H$ is nonempty. Let h_c be any element of this intersection; the lemma 3.3 allows us to choose h_c in $h_\alpha G(F)_c$, as required.

Assume $v_0(h_0) > v$. By an easy induction on v' , we see that the element:

$$h' = h \left(\prod_{\alpha, v_\alpha(h_\alpha)=v} h_\alpha \right)^{-1} = \prod_{\beta \in \overline{\Phi}, v_\beta(h_\beta) > v} h_\beta$$

belongs to H ; our claim follows then from the induction hypothesis applied to h' .

Now assume $v = v_0(h_0)$. Since H then meets $G(F)_{v,c_0}$, we deduce from the lemma 3.5 and the proof of the proposition 3.2, as above, that H contains an element of $h'_0 G(F)_{c_0}$, with h'_0 being an element of $T(F)$ such that $h'_0{}^{-1}h \in U_{0,v+1}$; hence h'_0 belongs to H . Since $h'_0{}^{-1}h \in H$ and $v_G(h'_0{}^{-1}h) > v$, we can use the induction hypothesis again.

Since the above claim is true for any $h \in H$, we have just shown the inclusion:

$$H \subset \prod_{\alpha \in \overline{\Phi}} (H \cap U_\alpha(F));$$

the other inclusion being obvious, the proposition is proved. $\square$

4 Normal functions

From now on and until the end of the paper, H will be a normal open pro-nilpotent subgroup of some parahoric subgroup of $G(F)$. Moreover, until the end of the proof of the theorem 1.2, G will be assumed to be quasi-simple, which amounts to say that Φ is connected.

Since every parahoric subgroup of $G(F)$ contains an Iwahori subgroup, and all Iwahori subgroups of $G(F)$ are conjugated, we may without loss of generality choose one of them and only consider its normal open pro-nilpotent subgroups; we will then make the following assumptions:

- the (extended) valuation $(v_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi}$ has been chosen in such a way that the subgroup $G(F)_0$ of $G(F)$ is a special parahoric subgroup. Moreover, for every $\alpha \in \Phi$, $v_\alpha(U'_\alpha) = \mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\}$;
- let $B(K)$ be the Borel subgroup of $G(K) \simeq G(F)_0/G(F)_0^+$ associated to Δ ; I is the inverse image of $B(K)$ in $G(F)_0$.

We then have $I = P_T U_{f_I}$, where f_I is the fonction on Φ defined by $f_I(\alpha) = 0$ (resp. $f_I(\alpha) = 1$) when α is a positive (resp. negative) root relatively to Δ , or equivalently $f_I(\alpha) = \varepsilon_\alpha$ for every $\alpha \in \Phi$.

We may easily check that if α, β are elements of Φ such that $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$, we have:

- if $\alpha + \beta$ is greater than α and β , then $f_I(\alpha + \beta) = f_I(\alpha) + f_I(\beta)$;
- if $\alpha + \beta$ is lesser than α and β , then $f_I(\alpha + \beta) = f_I(\alpha) + f_I(\beta) - 1$.

Write $H = T' U_{f_H}$ as in the preceding proposition. According to [2, I.6.4.43], f_H must satisfy:

$$f_H(\alpha + \beta) \leq f_I(\alpha) + f_H(\beta)$$

for every $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$ such that $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$. Conversely, for any f satisfying the above condition, there exists $T' \subset T$ such that $T' U_f$ is normal in I . We'll say f is a normal function for I if it satisfies that condition.

Consider the application $f_\varepsilon = f - f_I$ from Φ to $\mathbb{Z}$; we deduce from the above inequality that for every $\alpha, \alpha' \in \Phi$ such that $\alpha + \alpha' \in \Phi$ and $\alpha + \alpha' \geq \alpha$, we have:

$$f_\varepsilon(\alpha + \alpha') \leq f_\varepsilon(\alpha).$$

With the proposition 2.3 and an easy induction, we obtain that for every $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$ such that $\alpha \geq \beta$, $f_\varepsilon(\alpha) \leq f_\varepsilon(\beta)$. Moreover, we have the following results:

Lemma 4.1 *For every $\alpha \in \Phi$, we have $f_\varepsilon(\alpha) \leq f_\varepsilon(-\alpha) + 1$.*

Consider the element $u_\alpha(\varpi^{f_I(\alpha)})$ of I ; assuming $2\alpha \notin \Phi$, we have:

$$u_\alpha(\varpi^{f_I(\alpha)}) u_{-\alpha}(\varpi^{f_H(-\alpha)}) u_\alpha(-\varpi^{f_I(\alpha)})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= u_{-\alpha}(\varpi^{f_H(-\alpha)})\alpha^\vee(1 + \varpi^{f_H(-\alpha)+f_I(\alpha)}x)u_\alpha(\varpi^{(f_H(-\alpha)+2f_I(\alpha))}x'), \\
&= u_{-\alpha}(\varpi^{f_H(-\alpha)})\alpha^\vee(1 + \varpi^{1+(f_\varepsilon)(-\alpha)}x)u_\alpha(\varpi^{1+(f_\varepsilon)(-\alpha)+f_I(\alpha)}x'),
\end{aligned}$$

where x and x' are elements of $1 + \mathfrak{p}$. We deduce then from the proposition 1.1 that $U_{\alpha, (1+(f_\varepsilon)(-\alpha)+f_I(\alpha))} \subset H$, which implies $f_H(\alpha) \leq 1 + (f_\varepsilon)(-\alpha) + f_I(\alpha)$; hence the result. The proof when $2\alpha \in \Phi$ is left to the reader. $\square$

Lemma 4.2 *Let α be an element of Φ ; set $v = \text{Sup}(f_\varepsilon(\alpha), f_\varepsilon(-\alpha))$. For every $\beta \in \Phi$, $f_\varepsilon(\beta) \leq v + 1$.*

Assume there exists β such that $f_\varepsilon(\beta) \geq v + 2$; since we can always replace β by a smaller element of Φ , we may assume $\beta \in \Delta'$. Since $(\alpha, \varepsilon_\alpha) + (-\alpha, \varepsilon_{-\alpha}) = (0, 1) \geq (\beta, \varepsilon_\beta)$, we have either $\beta \leq \alpha$ or $\beta \leq -\alpha$; we may assume for example $\beta \leq \alpha$, which implies $-\alpha \leq -\beta$ and $f_\varepsilon(-\beta) \geq f_\varepsilon(\beta) - 1 \geq v + 1 > f_\varepsilon(-\alpha)$, hence a contradiction. $\square$

By a similar reasoning, we obtain:

Lemma 4.3 *Let α be any element of Φ ; set $v = \text{Inf}(f_\varepsilon(\alpha), f_\varepsilon(\beta))$. Then for every $\beta \in \Phi$, $f_\varepsilon(\beta) \geq v - 1$.*

We deduce from these three lemmas the following corollary:

Corollary 4.4 *There exists $v' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{Im}(f_\varepsilon)$ is contained in $\{v', v' + 1, v' + 2\}$. Moreover, if $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$ are such that $f_\varepsilon(\alpha) = v'$ and $f_\varepsilon(\beta) = v' + 2$, then $f_\varepsilon(-\alpha) = f_\varepsilon(-\beta) = v' + 1$.*

Set $v' = \text{Inf}_{\alpha \in \Phi} f_\varepsilon(\alpha)$; let α be an element of Φ such that $f_\varepsilon(\alpha) = v'$. Then according to the first lemma, $f_\varepsilon(-\alpha) \leq v' + 1$, and according to the second one, $f_\varepsilon(\beta) \leq v' + 2$ for every $\beta \in \Phi$. The second assertion of the corollary is an immediate consequence of the second and third lemmas. $\square$

In the sequel, we'll say f_H is:

- of type 1 if f_ε either is constant or takes only two consecutive different values $v', v' + 1$;
- of type 2 else.

5 Δ' -complete subsets of Φ

Consider the subset Ψ of the elements $\alpha \in \Phi$ such that $f_\varepsilon(\alpha)$ is maximal; we deduce from the previous section that for every $\alpha \in \Psi$ and every $\beta \in \Phi$ such that $\beta \leq \alpha$, $\beta \in \Psi$. We'll say a subset of Φ satisfying that condition is

a Δ' -complete subset of Φ . This section will be devoted to the study of some properties of such subsets, which will be useful in the determination of the x and r of the theorem.

Assume for example f_H is of type 1; x and r must satisfy $\alpha(x) - r \leq -v' - \varepsilon_\alpha$ for every $\alpha \in \Psi$, and $\alpha(x) - r \geq -v' - \varepsilon_\alpha$ for every $\alpha \notin \Psi$. Hence if $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t$ (resp. $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s$) are elements of Ψ (resp. $\Phi - \Psi$) whose sum is zero, we must have, setting $z = r - v'$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \varepsilon_{\alpha_i} \leq tz;$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^s \varepsilon_{\beta_j} \geq sz.$$

The purpose of the proposition 5.1 is to prove the existence of some z satisfying the above conditions; when this is done, the proposition 5.9 ensures the existence of a suitable x .

Until the end of the section, Ψ will be any Δ' -complete subset of Φ . We have:

Proposition 5.1 *Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t$ (resp. $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s$) be elements of Ψ (resp. $\Phi - \Psi$) such that $\sum_{i=1}^t (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) = (0, c)$ and $\sum_{j=1}^s (\beta_j, \varepsilon_{\beta_j}) = (0, d)$ for some integers c, d . Assume $s, t > 0$; then $\frac{c}{t} \leq \frac{d}{s}$, and if $\frac{c}{t} = \frac{d}{s}$, for every i, j , α_i and β_j are strongly orthogonal.*

As a first remark, we see that we can assume $\sum_{i=1}^{t'} \alpha_i \in \overline{\Phi}$ for every $t' \leq t$; let's proceed by induction on t' , the case $t' = 1$ being obvious. If the sum is zero, then $\sum_{i=1}^{t'+1} \alpha_i = \alpha_{t'+1} \in \overline{\Phi}$, as required; if the sum is nonzero, since $\sum_{i=t'+1}^t \alpha_i = -\sum_{i=1}^{t'} \alpha_i$, there exists $i' > t'$ such that $(\sum_{i=1}^{t'+1} \alpha_i, \alpha_{i'}) < 0$, and by rearranging the α_i , $i > t$, we may assume $i' = t + 1$, hence the result. (This is a slight variant of [1, I.proposition 1.19] but not a direct consequence of it.) From now on and unless another rearranging is explicitly mentioned, we will assume the α_i follow that property; we will make the same assumption about the β_j .

First we'll prove we can assume Φ to be simply-laced. (This shouldn't be really necessary to run the rest of the proof, but it makes it somewhat simpler.) It is well-known (see for example [9, par. 11], and in particular theorem 32) that when Φ is not simply-laced, there exists a simply-laced root system (Φ_{sl}, V_{sl}) and an automorphism σ of this root system, satisfying the following conditions:

- there exists a basis Δ_{sl} of Φ_{sl} such that $\sigma(\Delta_{sl}) = \Delta_{sl}$;
- V can be identified to the subspace of the elements of V_{sl} fixed by σ ;
- let W_{sl} be the Weyl group of Φ_{sl} , let $(\cdot, \cdot)_{sl}$ be a W_{sl} -invariant scalar product,

and let π be the orthogonal projection, according to this scalar product, from V_{sl} to V . Then $\pi(\Phi_{sl}) = \Phi$ and $\pi(\Delta_{sl}) = \Delta$; moreover, W is the subgroup of the elements of W_{sl} commuting with σ , and $(.,.)$ is the restriction of $(.,.)_{sl}$ to V .

Let α be an element of Φ and let α_{sl} be an element of Φ_{sl} whose image in Φ is α ; we have:

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \sigma^i(\alpha_{sl}),$$

where d is the order of σ . Moreover, the image of any positive element of Φ_{sl} is a positive element of Φ , hence $\varepsilon_{\alpha_{sl}} = \varepsilon_{\pi(\alpha_{sl})}$ for every $\alpha_{sl} \in \Phi_{sl}$.

Let $\Phi_{sl,aff}$ be the affine root system associated do Φ_{sl} ; the morphism π extends canonically to a morphism $\Phi_{sl,aff} \mapsto \Phi_{aff}$. Moreover, if Δ'_{sl} is the extended simple root system of Φ_{sl} associated do Δ_{sl} , we have $\pi(\Delta'_{sl}) = \Delta'$, and for every $(\alpha_{sl}, v) \in \Phi_{sl,aff}^+$, $h(\pi(\alpha_{sl}, v)) = h(\alpha_{sl}, v)$; in particular, $h(\Phi_{sl}) = h(\Phi)$, and $(\alpha_{sl}, v) \leq (\beta_{sl}, v')$ if and only if $\pi(\alpha_{sl}, v) \leq \pi(\beta_{sl}, v')$. We finally have the following results:

Lemma 5.2 *Let α, β be elements of Φ such that $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$; there exist $\alpha_{sl}, \beta_{sl} \in \Phi_{sl}$ such that $\alpha_{sl} + \beta_{sl} \in \Phi_{sl}$, $\pi(\alpha_{sl}) = \alpha$ and $\pi(\beta_{sl}) = \beta$.*

Assume first $(\alpha, \beta) < 0$, and let α'_{sl} (resp. β'_{sl}) be any element of Φ_{sl} whose image in Φ is α (resp. β). We have:

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \sigma^i(\alpha'_{sl}), \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \sigma^j(\beta'_{sl}) \right) < 0;$$

there exist then i, j such that $(\sigma^i(\alpha'_{sl}), \sigma^j(\beta_{sl})) < 0$, which proves the result. Suppose now $(\alpha, \beta) \geq 0$; we then have $(\alpha + \beta, -\beta) < 0$, and the above reasoning applied to $\alpha + \beta$ and $-\beta$ yields elements $(\alpha + \beta)_{sl}$ and $(-\beta)_{sl}$ of Φ whose sum is an element α_{sl} such that $\pi(\alpha_{sl}) = \alpha$, hence again the result. $\square$

Corollary 5.3 *Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t$ be elements of Φ such that $(\gamma, v) = \sum_{i=1}^t (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i})$ is an element of $\overline{\Phi}_{aff}$. There exist $\alpha_{sl,1}, \dots, \alpha_{sl,t}, \gamma_{sl} \in \Phi$ such that $\pi(\alpha_{s_i}) = \alpha_i$ for every i , $\pi(\gamma_{sl}) = \gamma$ and $(\gamma_{sl}, v) = \sum_{i=1}^t (\alpha_{sl,i}, \varepsilon_{\alpha_{sl,i}})$.*

This corollary follows from the previous lemma and an easy induction. $\square$

Assume the proposition is true in the simply-laced case. Let Ψ_{sl} be the subset of the elements of Φ_{sl} whose image belongs to Ψ ; since π preserves the partial order, Ψ_{sl} is a Δ' -complete subset of Φ_{sl} . Let $\alpha_{sl,1}, \dots, \alpha_{sl,t}$ (resp. $\beta_{sl,1}, \dots, \beta_{sl,s}$) be elements of Φ_{sl} whose images are the α_i (resp. the β_j) and which satisfy

the conditions of the previous corollary; the fact that $\frac{c}{t} \leq \frac{d}{s}$ is simply the first assertion in the simply-laced case; moreover, if for some i, j , α_i and β_j are not strongly orthogonal, by eventually conjugating all the β_j by σ^k for some k , we can assume $\alpha_{sl,i}$ and $\beta_{sl,i}$ are not strongly orthogonal, and by the simply-laced case, we obtain $\frac{c}{t} < \frac{d}{s}$, as required.

We will now assume Φ is simply-laced. In this case, two elements of Φ are strongly orthogonal if and only if they are orthogonal.

First we'll observe that if there exist families $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t)$ and $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s)$ such that $\frac{c}{t} \leq \frac{d}{s}$, then the families consisting of respectively d copies of the α_i and c copies of the β_j satisfy $t \leq s$. Hence if there don't exist any families $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t), (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s)$ such that $c = d$ and $t \leq s$, then for every families, we have $\frac{c}{t} > \frac{d}{s}$ and the proposition is proved. We'll then assume such families do actually exist.

Now we'll make the following claim: if $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t)$ and $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_t)$ satisfy the above condition, and are such that c is minimal among all families satisfying it, then $t = s$ and for every i, j , α_i and β_j are orthogonal. First we'll show:

Lemma 5.4 *For every proper nonempty subset J of $\{1, \dots, s\}$, $\sum_{j \in J} \beta_j \neq 0$.*

Assume there exists some J such that $\sum_{j \in J} \beta_j = 0$; let s' be the cardinal of J , and set $c' = \sum_{j \in J} \varepsilon_{\beta_j}$; we have $0 < c' < c$. Let t' be an element of $\{1, \dots, t\}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{t'} (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) \geq (0, c')$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{t'-1} (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) < (0, c')$; according to the proposition 2.4, there exist $\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_{t''-1} \in \Psi \cup \{0\}$, with $t'' \leq t'$, such that:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t''} (\alpha'_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha'_i}) = (0, c');$$

by minimality of c , we must have $t'' > s'$, hence $t' \geq s' + 1$. Moreover, the same argument applied to $\alpha_{t'}, \dots, \alpha_t$ yields $t - t' + 1 \geq s - s' + 1$; we then obtain $t + 1 \geq s + 2$, which contradicts our assumptions. Hence the lemma. $\square$

Now we'll prove the claim. Suppose there exists i, j such that $(\alpha_i, \beta_j) > 0$; we may assume $i = t$ and $j = s$. We have $\beta_s > \alpha_t$, $\delta_1 = \alpha_t - \beta_s \in \Phi$ and:

$$\gamma = \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} (\beta_j, \varepsilon_{\beta_j}) = \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) - (\delta_1, \varepsilon_{\delta_1}).$$

According to the previous lemma, γ is nonzero; there exists then $j \in \{1, \dots, s-1\}$ such that $(\beta_j, \gamma) > 0$, hence either $(\beta_j, \alpha_i) > 0$ for some i or $(\beta_j, -\delta_1) > 0$.

Assume $j = s - 1$; in the first case, assuming $i = t - 1$, we obtain;

$$\sum_{j=1}^{s-2} (\beta_j, \varepsilon_{\beta_j}) = \sum_{i=1}^{t-2} (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) - (\delta_1, \varepsilon_{\delta_1}) - (\delta_2, \varepsilon_{\delta_2}),$$

with $\delta_2 = \beta_{s-1} - \alpha_{t-1}$, and in the second case:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{s-2} (\beta_j, \varepsilon_{\beta_j}) = \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) - (\delta_1, \varepsilon_{\delta_1}) - (\beta_{s-1}, \varepsilon_{\beta_{s-1}}).$$

By iterating the process, we finally obtain, after eventually rearranging the β_j :

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^{t'} (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) - \sum_{k=1}^u (\delta_k, \varepsilon_{\delta_k}) - \sum_{j=1}^{s'} (\beta_j, \varepsilon_{\beta_j}),$$

with $s' + u = s$ and $t' + u = t$, hence $t' \leq s'$. Consider the equality:

$$\sum_{k=1}^u (\delta_k, \varepsilon_{\delta_k}) = \sum_{i=1}^{t'} (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) + \sum_{j=1}^{s'} (-\beta_j, -\varepsilon_{\beta_j}).$$

Although the members of this equality are not necessarily affine roots, we can here use a similar reasoning as in the proof of the proposition 2.4: if the sum δ of the δ_k is nonzero, there exists an element $\gamma \in \Delta'$ such that $(\delta, \gamma) > 0$, hence $(\delta_i, \gamma) > 0$ for some i ; by subtracting $(\gamma, \varepsilon_{\gamma})$ to some appropriate term of the right-hand side and iterating, we finally obtain an equality such as:

$$(0, c') = \sum_{i=1}^{t''} (\alpha'_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha'_i}) - \sum_{j=1}^{s''} (\beta'_j, \varepsilon_{\beta'_j}) - (0, s' - s''),$$

with $t' \leq t$, $s'' \leq s$ and the α'_i (resp. the β'_j) being elements of Ψ (resp. $\Phi - \Psi$); the last term of the right-hand side corresponds to the $(-\beta_j, -\varepsilon_{\beta_j})$ which are reduced to $(0, -1)$ that way. Hence:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t''} (\alpha'_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha'_i}) = \sum_{j=1}^{s''} (\beta'_j, \varepsilon_{\beta'_j}) + (0, c' + s' - s'').$$

Moreover, we have $t'' \leq t' \leq s' \leq s'' + (c' + s' - s'')$. If $(\alpha'_i, \beta'_j) > 0$ for some i, j , we can iterate the whole process to get even smaller sums satisfying similar inequalities.

Assume now $(\alpha'_i, \beta'_j) = 0$ for every i, j ; we will show by induction on $c' + s' - s''$ that it leads to a contradiction. First remark that the sum of the α'_i and the sum of the β'_j must be zero, since they are equal to each other and their product is zero. If $c' + s' - s'' = 0$, since $\sum_{i=1}^{t''} (\alpha'_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha'_i}) < (0, c)$, the equality is impossible by minimality of c ; if now $c' + s' - s'' > 0$, by subtracting $(\alpha'_{t''}, \varepsilon_{\alpha'_{t''}})$ to both sides, we obtain;

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t''-1} (\alpha'_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha'_i}) = \sum_{j=1}^{s''} (\beta'_j, \varepsilon_{\beta'_j}) + (-\alpha'_{t''}, c' + s' - s'' - 1 + \varepsilon_{-\alpha'_{t''}}).$$

after replacing $(-\alpha'_{t''}, c' + s' - s'' - 1 + \varepsilon_{-\alpha'_{t''}})$ by $(0, c' + s' - s'' - 1)$ in the right-hand side and applying the proposition 2.4 to the left-hand side, we can use the induction hypothesis to obtain the desired contradiction.

Since assuming $(\alpha_i, \beta_j) > 0$ for some i, j leads to a contradiction, and since the sum of the α_i is zero, we have just shown $(\alpha_i, \beta_j) = 0$ for every i, j . Let now δ be an element of Δ' such that $(\alpha_t, \delta) > 0$; since the sum of the $(\beta_j, \varepsilon_{\beta_j})$ is greater than $(\delta, \varepsilon_\delta)$, there exists j such that $\delta \leq \beta_j$. Assuming $j = s$, we have:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{s-1} (\beta_j, \varepsilon_{\beta_j}) < \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) + (\alpha_t - \delta),$$

hence, by applying the proposition 2.4:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{s-1} (\beta_j, \varepsilon_{\beta_j}) = \sum_{i=1}^t (\alpha'_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha'_i}),$$

the α'_i being elements of $\Psi \cup \{0\}$. If $t < s$, a similar reasoning as above leads to a similar contradiction; hence $t = s$ and the claim is proved.

Let's write c_0 for the minimal c defined as before, and set $t_0 = \frac{c_0}{z(\Psi)}$; for convenience, we will also set $s_0 = t_0$ and $d_0 = c_0$. We have the following result:

Lemma 5.5 *The integers c_0 and t_0 are relatively prime.*

Assume they are not, and let c', t' be positive and relatively prime integers such that $\frac{c'}{t'} = \frac{c_0}{t_0}$. We have either $\sum_{i=1}^{t'} (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) \geq (0, c')$ or $\sum_{i=t'+1}^{t_0} (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) \geq (0, c_0 - c')$. Moreover, c_0 is a multiple of c' ; by replacing, in the first case, the family $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{t'})$ by a family made of $\frac{c_0 - c'}{c'}$ copies of it, we are reduced to the second case. By applying proposition 2.4, we then obtain $\sum_{i=t'+1}^{t_0} (\alpha'_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha'_i}) = (0, c_0 - c')$, the α'_i being elements of $\Psi \cup \{0\}$.

Similarly (setting $s' = t'$ for convenience), either $\sum_{j=1}^{s'}(\beta_j, \varepsilon_{\beta_j}) \leq (0, c')$ or $\sum_{j=s'+1}^{s_0}(\beta_j, \varepsilon_{\beta_j}) \leq (0, c_0 - c')$. By the same argument as above, we only have to consider the second case; by applying again proposition 2.4, we obtain as in the proof of the claim an equality such as:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{s''}(\beta'_j, \varepsilon_{\beta'_j}) + (0, (s_0 - s') - s'') = (0, c_0 - c'),$$

with $t_0 - t' = s_0 - s' \leq s'' + (s_0 - s' - s'')$. We conclude by the same reasoning as in the proof of the claim that it is incompatible with the minimality of c_0 . $\square$

Let $z(\Psi)$ be the quotient $\frac{c_0}{t_0} = \frac{d_0}{s_0}$; as a consequence of the claim, it doesn't depend on the choice of the α_i and β_j .

Now we'll return to the general case. We'll show the following result, which will imply the proposition: for every $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t)$ and $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s)$, we have $\frac{c}{t} \leq z(\Psi) \leq \frac{d}{s}$, and both inequalities are equalities only if $(\alpha_i, \beta_j) = 0$ for every i, j .

Assume first c and d are multiples of c_0 , say $c = c_1 c_0$ and $d = d_1 c_0$, and $\frac{c}{t} \geq \frac{d}{s}$; we'll show we then have $\frac{c}{t} = z(\Psi) = \frac{d}{s}$, and for every i, j , $(\alpha_i, \beta_j) = 0$. We'll proceed by induction on $c_1 + d_1$.

First remark that if Ψ is Δ' -complete, $-(\Phi - \Psi)$ is Δ' -complete too; moreover, by replacing Ψ by $-(\Phi - \Psi)$, we replace $z(\Psi)$ by $1 - z(\Psi)$, c_0 by $t_0 - c_0$ and the α_i (resp. the β_j) by the $-\beta_j$ (resp. the $-\alpha_i$), hence if the result is true for some c_1, d_1 and for Ψ and $-(\Phi - \Psi)$, it is also true with c_1 and d_1 switched. Hence we may assume $\frac{c}{t} \geq z(\Psi)$, if not, then $\frac{d}{s} \leq z(\Psi)$ and we fall into the symmetrical case.

The case $c_1 = d_1 = 1$ is simply the claim. If $c_1 = 1$ and $d_1 > 1$, then the same claim asserts $\frac{c}{t} = z(\Psi)$, hence $\frac{d}{s} \leq z(\Psi)$ and we fall again into the symmetrical case; assume then $c_1 > 1$.

Remark: when we'll apply the induction hypothesis, it will always be to some $\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_{t'}$ and to $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s$, hence the β_j won't be mentioned. Moreover, since no other elements of $\Phi - \Psi$ than $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s$ will occur in the proof, we can reduce ourselves to the case where Ψ is the largest Δ' -complete subset of Φ not containing them, i.e. that it contains every element of Φ which is not greater than any β_j .

Let $t' \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^{t'}(\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) \geq (0, c_0)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{t'-1}(\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) < (0, c_0)$. By applying proposition 2.4 and the induction hypothesis to $\sum_{i=1}^{t'}(\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i})$ (resp. $\sum_{i=t'}^t(\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i})$), we obtain $t' \geq \frac{c_0}{z(\Psi)}$ and $t - t' + 1 \geq \frac{c - c_0}{z(\Psi)}$. Since $t \leq \frac{c}{z(\Psi)}$,

at least one of the above inequalities is an equality, and both are equalities if $t < \frac{c}{z(\Psi)}$.

Assume for example $t' = \frac{c_0}{z(\Psi)}$, the case $t - t' + 1 = \frac{c - c_0}{z(\Psi)}$ being symmetrical; we will then show that $(\alpha_i, \beta_j) = 0$ for every i, j .

Set $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{t'} \alpha_i$. If $\gamma = 0$, the assertion follows immediately from the induction hypothesis applied first to $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{t'})$ and then to $(\alpha_{t'-1}, \dots, \alpha_t)$; assume now $\gamma \neq 0$. The element γ cannot be equal to any α_i , since we would then have $\sum_{i' \neq i} (\alpha_{i'}, \varepsilon_{\alpha_{i'}}) = (0, c_0)$, which is impossible by the induction hypothesis because $\frac{c_0}{t'-1} > z(\Psi)$; since Φ is simply-laced, we then have $(\gamma, \gamma) = 2$ and $(\alpha_i, \gamma) \leq 1$ for every i , hence there exist at least two different i such that $(\alpha_i, \gamma) > 0$; let's call them i and i' . The character $\alpha_i - \gamma$ is then an element of Φ , and $\alpha_i \geq \gamma$ since the equality $\sum_{i'' \neq i} (\alpha_{i''}, \varepsilon_{\alpha_{i''}}) = (\gamma - \alpha_i, c_0 + \varepsilon_{\gamma - \alpha_i})$ is impossible (apply proposition 2.4 and the induction hypothesis to check this); we then have:

$$\sum_{i'' \neq i} (\alpha_{i''}, \varepsilon_{\alpha_{i''}}) + (\alpha_i - \gamma, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i - \gamma}) = (0, c_0).$$

Since $t' = \frac{c_0}{z(\Psi)}$ and $\alpha_i - \gamma \in \Psi$, we deduce from the induction hypothesis that $(\alpha_{i''}, \beta_j) = 0$ for every $i'' \neq i$ and every j ; by replacing i by i' , we see that it is also true for $i'' = i$.

We deduce from this that $(\gamma, \beta_j) = 0$ for every j ; with the help of the proposition 2.4, we can even replace γ by any smaller element, which way we see that for every element δ of Δ' occurring in the decomposition of γ , $(\delta, \beta_j) = 0$ for every j .

Moreover, we have $\gamma' = \gamma + \alpha_{t'+1} \in \Phi$; we will show that the above remarks imply $\gamma' \in \Psi$. With the proposition 2.3 and an easy induction, we see that we can assume $\gamma \in \Delta'$. Suppose $\gamma' \notin \Psi$; by the assumption made on Ψ , we then have $\gamma' \geq \beta_j$ for some j . Write:

$$\gamma' = \sum_{\delta \in \Delta'} c_\delta \delta;$$

$$\beta_j = \sum_{\delta \in \Delta'} b_\delta \delta.$$

Then $c_\delta \geq b_\delta$ for every $\delta \in \Delta'$, and $c_\gamma = b_\gamma$ since $\alpha_{t'+1}$ isn't greater than β_j . Hence:

$$(\gamma, \beta_j) = 2b_\gamma - \sum_{\delta, (\delta, \gamma) = -1} b_\delta$$

$$\geq 2c_\gamma - \sum_{\delta, (\delta, \gamma) = -1} c_\delta = (\gamma, \gamma') > 0,$$

which leads to a contradiction.

Consider now the equality:

$$(\gamma', \varepsilon_{\gamma'}) + \sum_{i=t'+2}^t (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) = (0, c - c_0).$$

By the induction hypothesis, we have $t - t' = \frac{c - c_0}{z(\Psi)}$, hence $t = \frac{c}{z(\Psi)}$, and for every j , $(\gamma', \beta_j) = 0$ and $(\alpha_i, \beta_j) = 0$ for every $i \geq t' + 2$; since we already know this is also true for α_i , $i \leq t$, and γ , we obtain the desired assertion.

Assume finally c is not a multiple of c_0 ; by considering the equality:

$$c_0 \left(\sum_{i=1}^t (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) \right) = (0, c_0 c),$$

we obtain $\frac{c_0 c}{c_0 t} \leq z(\Psi)$, hence $t \geq cz(\Psi)$. Since $cz(\Psi)$ is not an integer, we see the inequality is always strict. The case where d is not a multiple of d_0 is treated similarly, and concludes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

For every $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t \in \Psi$ (resp. $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s \in \Phi - \Psi$) whose sum is zero, if $t > 0$ (resp. $s > 0$), set:

$$z(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \varepsilon_{\alpha_i},$$

and define $z(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s)$ similarly. Write:

$$z(\Psi) = \sup_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t)} z(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t),$$

$$z'(\Psi) = \inf_{(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s)} z(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s),$$

the upper (resp. lower) bound being taken over all the families $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t)$, $t > 0$ (resp. $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s)$, $s > 0$) of elements of Ψ (resp. $\Phi - \Psi$) whose sum is zero; set $z(\Psi) = 0$ (resp. $z'(\Psi) = 1$) if there is no such family in Ψ (resp. $\Phi - \Psi$). This definition of $z(\Psi)$ is clearly consistent with the one used in the proof of the proposition, and we deduce from this same proposition that $z(\Psi) \leq z'(\Psi)$.

Moreover, we have the following result:

Lemma 5.6 *There exist $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t \in \Psi$ (resp. $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s \in \Phi - \Psi$) such that $z(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t) = z(\Psi)$ (resp. $z(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s) = z'(\Psi)$).*

We will show the result for $z(\Psi)$, the proof for $z'(\Psi)$ being similar. To prove the desired assertion, we only have to show that the upper bound may be taken on a finite number of families. Let's show the following lemmas:

Lemma 5.7 *Assume there exists $t' < t$ such that $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_{t'} = 0$. Then we have:*

$$z(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t) \leq \text{Sup}(z(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{t'}), z(\alpha_{t'+1}, \dots, \alpha_t)).$$

We have $z(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t) = \frac{t'z(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{t'}) + (t-t')z(\alpha_{t'+1}, \dots, \alpha_t)}{t}$, hence the result. $\square$

Lemma 5.8 *Assume $t > \text{card}(\Phi) + 1$. Then after eventually rearranging the α_i , there exists $t' < t$ such that $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_{t'} = 0$.*

We can assume $\gamma_{t'} = \sum_{i=1}^{t'} \alpha_i$ is an element of $\overline{\Phi}$ for every $t' < t$. If one of them is zero there is nothing to prove; if all of them are nonzero, since $t > \text{card}(\Phi) + 1$, there exist $t' < t''$ such that $\gamma_{t'} = \gamma_{t''}$; we then have $\sum_{i=t'+1}^{t''} \alpha_i = 0$, hence the result. $\square$

According to these two lemmas, we only have to take the upper bound on the set of families $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t)$ such that $t \leq \text{card}(\Phi) + 1$; since this set is obviously finite, the lemma 5.6 is proved. $\square$

Now we'll be concerned about the element x of $\mathcal{A}$ mentioned in the theorem. Let A_I be the facet of $\mathcal{B}$ associated to I , and $\overline{A_I}$ its closure; we have:

Proposition 5.9 *Let z be any element of $[z(\Psi), z'(\Psi)]$. There exists an element x of $\overline{A_I}$ such that:*

- for every $\alpha \in \Psi$, $\alpha(x) \leq z - \varepsilon_\alpha$;
- for every $\alpha \in \Phi - \Psi$, $\alpha(x) \geq z - \varepsilon_\alpha$.

Moreover, if $z(\Psi) < z'(\Psi)$, the set of such elements contains an open subset of $\mathcal{A}$.

Let $E_{\Psi, z}$ be the subset of the elements x of $\mathcal{A}$ such that:

- for every $\alpha \in \Delta'$, $\alpha(x) \geq -\varepsilon_\alpha$;
- for every maximal element α of Ψ , $\alpha(x) \leq z - \varepsilon_\alpha$;
- for every minimal element α of $\Phi - \Psi$, $\alpha(x) \geq z - \varepsilon_\alpha$.

(The first condition simply amounts to say that $x \in \overline{A_I}$.) Let x be any element of $E_{\Psi, z}$; since for every $\alpha \in \Phi$ and every $\beta \in \Delta'$ such that $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$, we

have $\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta} = \varepsilon_\alpha + \varepsilon_\beta$, we obtain by an easy induction that for every $\alpha \in \Phi$, $\alpha(x) \geq -\varepsilon_\alpha$; by a similar argument, for every $\alpha \in \Psi$, $\alpha(x) \leq z - \varepsilon_\alpha$, and for every $\alpha \in \Phi - \Psi$, $\alpha(x) \geq z - \varepsilon_\alpha$; hence x satisfies the condition of the lemma. We then only have to show that $E_{\Psi,z}$ is nonempty.

Let Φ_m be the subset of Φ containing $-\Delta'$, the maximal elements of Ψ and the opposites of the minimal elements of $\Phi - \Psi$; set, for every $\alpha \in \Phi_m$:

- if $\alpha \in \Psi$, $f_z(\alpha) = z - \varepsilon_\alpha$;
- if α is the opposite of some minimal element of $\Phi - \Psi$, $f_z(\alpha) = -z + \varepsilon_{-\alpha} = 1 - z - \varepsilon_\alpha$;
- if $\alpha \in -\Delta'$, $f_z(\alpha) = \varepsilon_{-\alpha} = 1 - \varepsilon_\alpha$;
- if α satisfies more than one of the above conditions, f_z takes the lowest possible value.

The set $E_{\Psi,z}$ is nonempty if and only if for every $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t \in \Phi_m$ whose sum is zero, $\sum_{i=1}^t f_z(\alpha_i) \geq 0$. The first assertion of the proposition follows then from the following result:

Lemma 5.10 *Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t$ (resp. $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s$) be elements of Ψ (resp. $\Phi - \Psi$) such that $\sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i = \sum_{j=1}^s \beta_j$. Set:*

$$c_0 = \sum_{i=1}^t \varepsilon_{\alpha_i} + \sum_{j=1}^s \varepsilon_{-\beta_j}.$$

Then $tz + s(1 - z) \geq c_0$, and the inequality is strict if $z(\Psi) < z'(\Psi)$ and $s, t > 0$.

Write $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i = \sum_{j=1}^s \beta_j$. Note that γ is not necessarily an element of $\overline{\Phi}$.

We'll show the lemma by induction on s . Assume first $\gamma = 0$, and let c'_0 (resp. c''_0) be the sum of the ε_{α_i} (resp. the ε_{β_j}). It follows immediately from the definition of $z(\Psi)$ and $z'(\Psi)$ that we have $tz \geq c'_0$ and $sz \leq c''_0$, and that at least one of these inequalities is strict if $z(\Psi) < z'(\Psi)$ and $s, t > 0$; hence:

$$tz + s(1 - z) \geq c'_0 + s - c''_0 = c_0,$$

and the inequality is strict if $z(\Psi) < z'(\Psi)$ and $s, t > 0$.

Moreover, since for each j , $\varepsilon_{-\beta_j} = 1 - \varepsilon_{\beta_j}$, we obtain:

$$c'_0 + s - c''_0 = \sum_{i=1}^t \varepsilon_{\alpha_i} + \sum_{j=1}^s \varepsilon_{-\beta_j} = c_0,$$

which proves $tz + s(1 - z) \geq c_0$ ($> c_0$ if $z(\Psi) < z'(\Psi)$ and $s, t > 0$). Assume now $\gamma \neq 0$; we now have:

$$(\sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i, \sum_{j=1}^s \beta_j) > 0;$$

there exist then $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $j_0 \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $(\alpha_{i_0}, \beta_{j_0}) > 0$; we will assume $i_0 = t$ and $j_0 = s$. We have $\alpha_t - \beta_s \in \Phi$, and since $\alpha_t \in \Psi$ and $\beta_s \notin \Psi$, $\beta_s = \alpha_t + (\beta_s - \alpha_t) > \alpha_t$, $\beta_s - \alpha_t$, hence $\alpha_t - \beta_s > -\beta_s$, α ; we then have $h(\alpha_t) + h(-\beta_s) = h(\alpha_t - \beta_s) < h(\Phi)$. Consider now the equality:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) + \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} (-\beta_j, \varepsilon_{-\beta_j}) = (-\alpha_t + \beta_s, c_0 - 1).$$

According to the proposition 2.4, there exist $\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_t \in \Psi \cup \{0\}$ (resp. $\beta'_1, \dots, \beta'_s \in (\Phi - \Psi) \cup \{0\}$) such that for every i (resp. j), $\alpha'_i \leq \alpha_i$ (resp. $\beta'_i \geq \beta_i$) and:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (\alpha'_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha'_i}) + \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} (-\beta'_j, \varepsilon_{-\beta'_j}) = (0, c_0 - 1),$$

and we deduce from the induction hypothesis:

$$(s-1)z + (t-1)(1-z) \geq c_0 - 1,$$

with a strict inequality if $z(\Psi) < z'(\Psi)$ and $s, t > 0$; hence the result. $\square$

Assume now $z(\Psi) < z'(\Psi)$; we'll show that E_{Ψ_z} contains an open subset of $\mathcal{A}$. Assume this is not the case; since E_{Ψ_z} is obviously convex, it is then contained in the hyperplane defined by some equation $\gamma(y) = \lambda$, with $\gamma \in X^*(T)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, hence:

- there exist $\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_{t'} \in \Phi_m$ whose sum is γ and such that $\sum_{i=1}^{t'} f_z(\alpha'_i) = \lambda$;
- there exist $\beta'_1, \dots, \beta'_{s'} \in \Phi_m$ whose sum is $-\gamma$ and such that $\sum_{j=1}^{s'} f_z(\beta'_j) = -\lambda$.

We then have $\sum_{i=1}^{t'} \alpha'_i + \sum_{j=1}^{s'} \beta'_j = 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{t'} f_z(\alpha'_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{s'} f_z(\beta'_j) = 0$; this is possible only if all the inequalities occuring in the proof of the previous lemma, when applied to those elements, are equalities, and in particular if $tz = c'_0$ and $sz = c''_0$, which implies $z(\Psi) = z = z'(\Psi)$. Hence the result. $\square$

6 Proof of the theorem 1.2

In this section, we'll prove the main theorem. Let's begin by the following preliminary result:

Lemma 6.1 *Assume $H = T'U_{x,r}$ for some T', x, r . Then $H \subset G_{x,r}$.*

Since T' fixes $\mathcal{A}$ pointwise, H fixes $B(x, r) \cap \mathcal{A}$ pointwise. Moreover, let y be any element of $B(x, r)$, and let $\mathcal{A}'$ be an apartment of $\mathcal{B}$ containing A_I and y (such an apartment exists by [2, I.2.3.1]). According to [2, I.2.5.8], there exists $g \in G^0$ such that $g(y) \in \mathcal{A}$ and g fixes A_I pointwise, hence $g \in I$; y is then fixed by $gHg^{-1} = H$. Hence H fixes $B(x, r)$ pointwise, which amounts to say it is contained in $G_{x,r}$, as required. $\square$

Now let's go on into the proof of the theorem. First we'll suppose Φ is of type 1; let Ψ be the subset of the elements $\alpha \in \Phi$ such that $f_\varepsilon(\alpha) = v' + 1$. We have already seen Ψ is Δ' -complete; let's show the following result:

Proposition 6.2 *Let z be any element of $[z(\Psi), z'(\Psi)]$; set $r = v' + z$. Let x be any element of $E_{\Psi,z}$; we have:*

$$U_{x,r}^+ \subset H \subset G_{x,r}.$$

Let $f_{x,r}$ be the concave function associated to $G_{x,r}$; we have, for every $\alpha \in \Phi$:

$$f_{x,r}(\alpha) = \text{ceil}(-\alpha(x) + r).$$

With the help of the previous lemma, in order to show that $H \subset G_{x,r}$, we only have to prove that $f \geq f_{x,r}$. Let α be any element of Φ ; if $\alpha \in \Psi$, we have, using the definition of $E_{\Psi,z}$ and the fact that $f_H(\alpha)$ is an integer:

$$\begin{aligned} f_H(\alpha) &= v' + 1 + \varepsilon_\alpha = r + 1 - (-\varepsilon_\alpha) - z \\ &\geq \text{ceil}(-\alpha(x) + r - z) \geq f_{x,r}(\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

and if $\alpha \notin \Psi$:

$$f_H(\alpha) = v' + \varepsilon_\alpha = r - (z - \varepsilon_\alpha) \geq \text{ceil}(-\alpha(x) + r),$$

hence the result.

Let now $f_{x,r}^+$ be the concave function associated to $G_{x,r}^+$; we have for every $\alpha \in \Phi$:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{x,r}^+(\alpha) &= \inf_{r' > r} f_{\alpha,x,r'}(\alpha) = \text{ceil}(-\alpha(x) + r') \\ &= \text{floor}(-\alpha(x) + r + 1); \end{aligned}$$

we'll show that $f \leq f_{x,r}^+$, which will imply $U_{x,r}^+ \subset H$. For every $\alpha \in \Phi$, we have, when $\alpha \in \Psi$:

$$f_H(\alpha) = r + 1 - (z - \varepsilon_\alpha) \leq \text{floor}(r + 1 - \alpha(x)),$$

and when $\alpha \notin \Psi$:

$$\begin{aligned} f_H(\alpha) &= r + 1 - (1 - \varepsilon_\alpha) - z \\ &\leq \text{floor}(r + 1 - \alpha(x) - z) \leq f_{x,r}^+(\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

hence again the result. $\square$

First consider the case $z(\Psi) < z'(\Psi)$; we will show that the groups H such that $U_{x,r} \subset H \subset G_{x,r}$ for some x, r are the ones which satisfy this condition. Since we can choose $z = r - v'$ anywhere in $[z(\Psi), z'(\Psi)]$, there exist $r < r'$ and x, x' such that the previous proposition holds for both x, r and x', r' . In particular we obtain:

$$U_{x,r''} \subset H \subset G_{x',r'}$$

for any $r'' > r$. Unfortunately this isn't enough since the inclusion $U_{x,r''} \subset U_{x',r'}$ may very well be strict even if $r'' < r'$; this problem will be solved by checking that we may assume $x = x'$, which is done by the following lemma:

Lemma 6.3 *There exist $z < z' \in [z(\Psi), z'(\Psi)]$ such that $E_{\Psi,z} \cap E_{\Psi,z'} \neq \emptyset$.*

Since $z(\Psi) < z'(\Psi)$, for every z , $E_{\Psi,z}$ contains an open subset of A_I , hence its volume is nonzero. Assume all $E_{\Psi,z}$ are disjoint; then A_I contains an uncountable union of disjoint subsets with positive volume, which is impossible. $\square$

Corollary 6.4 *Set $r' = z' + v'$; we have $U_{x,r'} \subset H \subset G_{x,r'}$.*

According to the proposition 6.2 and the previous lemma, we now have $U_{x,r'} \subset U_{x,r}^+ \subset H \subset G_{x,r'}$. $\square$

Hence the theorem is proved for f_H of type 1 and such that $z(\Psi) < z'(\Psi)$. In this case, we may show the following converse:

Proposition 6.5 *Assume $U_{x,r} \subset H \subset G_{x,r}$ for some x, r , and set $r = z + v'$, with $z \in [0, 1]$ and v' being an integer. Then f_H is of type 1 and $z(\Psi) < z'(\Psi)$.*

For every $\alpha \in \Phi$, we have:

$$f_\varepsilon(\alpha) = \text{ceil}(-\alpha(x) + r) - \varepsilon_\alpha \in \{\text{ceil}(r - 1), \text{ceil}(r)\},$$

hence f_H is of type 1. Moreover, since the valuation is discrete, we have $H = G_{x,r}$ for every r in some interval $]r', r'']$, with $r' < r''$; we obviously can assume $\text{floor}(r') = \text{floor}(r'') = v'$. Since $f_H(x) = \text{ceil}(-\alpha(x) + r)$ for every $\alpha \in \Phi$ and every $r \in]r', r'']$, setting $z' = r' - v'$ and $z'' = r'' - v'$, we obtain that every element α of Ψ (resp. $\Phi - \Psi$) must satisfy $\alpha(x) < z'$ (resp. $\alpha(x) \geq z''$), hence $z(\Psi) \leq z' < z'' \leq z'(\Psi)$. $\square$

Suppose now f_H is still of type 1, but such that $z(\Psi) = z'(\Psi)$; according to the previous proposition, H cannot be equal to any group of the form $T'U_{x,r}$. Such a case actually occurs: for example, take $G = SL_4$, and:

$$H = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \mathfrak{p} & \mathfrak{p} & \mathfrak{p} & \mathcal{O} \\ \mathfrak{p} & 1 + \mathfrak{p} & \mathfrak{p} & \mathcal{O} \\ \mathfrak{p}^2 & \mathfrak{p} & 1 + \mathfrak{p} & \mathfrak{p} \\ \mathfrak{p}^2 & \mathfrak{p} & \mathfrak{p} & 1 + \mathfrak{p} \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

It is easy to check that this group is a normal subgroup of I and that the corresponding concave function f_H is of type 1. Moreover, we have:

$$\Psi = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \alpha_3, -\alpha_M, \alpha_3 - \alpha_M.\}$$

Since $(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + (\alpha_3 - \alpha_M) = 0$, we have $z(\Psi) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, and since $(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3) + (\alpha_1 - \alpha_M) = 0$, we have $z'(\Psi) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Hence $z(\Psi) = z'(\Psi) = \frac{1}{2}$.

Consider the families $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s)$ of elements of $\Phi - \Psi$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^s (\beta_j, \varepsilon_{\beta_j}) = (0, d)$ with $\frac{d}{s} = z'(\Psi)$; let's call them $z'(\Psi)$ -families. Let Φ_0 be the root subsystem of elements of Φ which are linear combinations of elements of such families; we have:

Proposition 6.6 *The rank of the root subsystem Φ_0 of Φ is strictly smaller than the rank of Φ .*

Since $z(\Psi) = z'(\Psi)$, there exist $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t \in \Psi$ and an integer c such that $\sum_{i=1}^t (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) = (0, c)$ and $\frac{c}{t} = z(\Psi)$. According to the proposition 5.1, every element of Φ_0 is then strongly orthogonal to all the α_i , and this implies the result. $\square$

Moreover, set $\Psi_0 = \Psi \cap \Phi_0$; we obviously have $z'(\Psi_0) = z'(\Psi)$, and since the α_i of the previous proposition cannot belong to Φ_0 , $z(\Psi_0)$ is strictly smaller than $z(\Psi)$. Let M be the Levi subgroup of G generated by T and the U_α , $\alpha \in \Phi_0$; M is proper, and since $H \cap M$ is obviously normal in the Iwahori subgroup $I \cap M$ of M , according to the corollary 6.4, there exists an element x of the apartment $\mathcal{A}_M$ of the Bruhat-Tits building of M associated to S and an element r of $[v', v' + 1] \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $U_{M,x,r} \subset H \cap M \subset M_{x,r}$; moreover, using the canonical projection $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_M$, with a slight abuse of notation, setting $z = r - v'$, we will also call $E_{\Psi_0,z}$ the convex subset of $\mathcal{A}$ whose image in $\mathcal{M}$ is $E_{\Psi_0,z}$; we may then consider x as an element of $\mathcal{A}$.

Now we'll determine r' . we have the following result:

Lemma 6.7 *Let Ψ' be the subset of Φ which is the union of Ψ and all $z'(\Psi)$ -families. Then Ψ' is Δ' -complete. and $z(\Psi) = z(\Psi')$.*

Let's show the first assertion: we will in fact show the equivalent assertion that $-(\Phi - \Psi')$ is Δ' -complete. Let α be any element of $\Phi - \Psi'$. Assume there exists $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_t \in \Phi - \Psi$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^t (\beta_i, \varepsilon_{\beta_i}) = (0, d)$, with $d = tz'(\Psi)$, and $\beta_t \geq \alpha$; we then have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (\beta_i, \varepsilon_{\beta_i}) \leq (-\alpha, d - 1 + \varepsilon_{-\alpha}).$$

According to the proposition 2.4, there exist then $\beta'_1, \dots, \beta'_{t-1} \in \Phi - \Psi$ (one may check as in the proof of the proposition 5.1 that assuming that at least one of the $(\beta_i, \varepsilon_{\beta_i})$ is reduced to $(0, 1)$ leads to a contradiction) such that:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (\beta'_i, \varepsilon_{\beta'_i}) = (-\alpha, d - 1 + \varepsilon_{-\alpha}),$$

hence:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (\beta'_i, \varepsilon_{\beta'_i}) + (\alpha, \varepsilon_\alpha) = (0, d).$$

Hence the family $(\beta'_1, \dots, \beta'_{t-1}, \alpha)$ is a $z'(\Psi)$ -family. Since $\alpha \notin \Psi'$, this is impossible; β_t cannot then be greater than α . Since we already know that no

element of Ψ can be greater than α , we have just shown that every element of Φ which is greater than α belongs to $\Phi - \Psi'$; hence $-(\Phi - \Psi')$ is Δ' -complete.

Now we'll prove that $z(\Psi) = z(\Psi')$. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t$ be elements of Ψ' such that $\sum_{i=1}^t (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) = (0, c)$, with $\frac{c}{t} \geq z(\Psi)$. Assume $\alpha_i \in \Psi$ for every $i \leq t'$, and α_i belongs to some $z(\Psi)$ -family if $i > t'$; in the second case, let $\beta_{i,1}, \dots, \beta_{i,s_i-1}$ be the other members of that family. Setting $d_i = \frac{s_i}{z(\Phi)}$ for every $i > t'$, we obtain:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t'} (\alpha_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha_i}) + \sum_{i=t'+1}^t (0, d_i) = \sum_{i=t'+1}^t \sum_{j=1}^{s_i-1} (\beta_{i,j}, \varepsilon_{\beta_{i,j}}) + (0, c).$$

By the same process as in the proof of the proposition 5.1, we can obtain an equality:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_{i=1}^{t''} (\alpha'_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha'_i}) + \sum_{i=t'+1}^t (0, d_i) - \sum_{j=1}^{s'} (\beta'_j, \varepsilon_{\beta'_j}) \\ &+ (0, -c - \sum_{i=t'+1}^t (s_i - 1) + s'), \end{aligned}$$

where $t'' \leq t'$, $s' \leq \sum_{i=t'+1}^t (s_i - 1)$ and the α'_i (resp. the β'_j) are elements of Ψ (resp. $\Phi - \Psi$) such that $(\alpha'_i, \beta'_j) = 0$ for every i, j . The sum of the α'_i (resp. β'_j) must then be zero; writing $(0, c') = \sum_{i=1}^{t''} (\alpha'_i, \varepsilon_{\alpha'_i})$ (resp. $(0, d') = \sum_{j=1}^{s'} (\beta'_j, \varepsilon_{\beta'_j})$), we obtain:

$$c' + \sum_{i=t'+1}^t d_i - d' - c - \sum_{i=t'+1}^t (s_i - 1) + s' = 0,$$

hence, since by definition $c' \leq t''z(\Psi)$ and $d' \geq s'z'(\Psi) = s'z(\Psi)$, and by assumption $c \geq tz(\Psi)$:

$$(t'' + \sum_{i=t'+1}^t s_i - s' - t)z(\Psi) - \sum_{i=t'+1}^t (s_i - 1) + s \geq 0,$$

which can be rewritten as:

$$(t'' - t')z(\Psi) + (\sum_{i=t'+1}^t (s_i - 1) - s')(z(\Psi) - 1) \geq 0.$$

Since $0 < z(\Psi) < 1$, $t'' \leq t'$ and $\sum_{i=t'+1}^t (s_i - 1) \geq s'$, this is possible only if all the inequalities we have combined to get the above one are equalities, and

in particular if $v = tz(\Psi)$. Hence $z(\Psi') \leq z(\Psi)$; since the other inequality is obvious, the lemma is proved. $\square$

According to the first lemma, if f'_H is the concave function on Φ associated to Ψ_1 , $U_{f'_H}$ is normal in I ; moreover, we obviously have $z'(\Psi') > z'(\Psi)$ hence $z(\Psi') < z'(\Psi')$ by the second lemma. There exist then $x' \in \mathcal{A}$ and $r' > r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $U_{f'_H} = U_{x',r'}$.

Moreover, since $H \cap M$ is contained in I , it normalizes $U_{f'_H}$. Since for every $\alpha \in \Phi$, we have $f'_H(\alpha) \geq f_H(\alpha)$ if $\alpha \in \Psi_0$ and $f'_H(\alpha) = f_H(\alpha)$ if $\alpha \notin \Psi_0$, we obtain:

$$H = (H \cap M)U_{x',r'} = T'U_{M,x,r}U_{x',r'}$$

for some $T' \subset P_T$.

It remains to see that we can choose $x = x'$, or equivalently, that the intersection $E_{\Psi_0,z} \cap E_{\Psi',z'}$ is nonempty for some $z' > z$. Let Ψ'' be the smallest Δ' -complete subset of Φ containing Ψ_0 ; we have $z(\Psi'') < z(\Psi)$, and $z'(\Psi'') = z'(\Psi)$ by a similar argument as in the lemma 6.7. Moreover, we have:

Lemma 6.8 *Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t$ (resp. $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r, \delta_1, \dots, \delta_q$) be elements of Ψ'' (resp. $\Phi - \Psi'', \Psi', \Phi - \Psi'$) such that $\sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i + \sum_{k=1}^r \gamma_k = \sum_{j=1}^s \beta_j + \sum_{l=1}^q \delta_l$. Set:*

$$c_0 = \sum_{i=1}^t \varepsilon_{\alpha_i} + \sum_{j=1}^s \varepsilon_{-\beta_j} + \sum_{k=1}^r \varepsilon_{\gamma_k} + \sum_{l=1}^q \varepsilon_{-\delta_l}.$$

Then $tz + s(1 - z) + rz' + q(1 - z') \geq c_0$ for $z' > z(\Psi) > z$ and z and z' close enough to each other.

If there exist i, j such that $(\alpha_i, \beta_j) > 0$, we can use the induction hypothesis as in the proof of the lemma 5.10; assume that $(\alpha_i, \beta_j) \leq 0$ for every i, j . For the same reason, we can also assume $(\gamma_k, \delta_l) \leq 0$ for every k, l , and since $z' + 1 - z \geq 1$, $(\beta_j, \gamma_k) \leq 0$ for every j, k ; moreover, if $z' \geq 1 - z$ (resp. $z' \leq 1 - z$), we have $z + z' \geq 1$ (resp. $(1 - z) + (1 - z') \geq 1$, hence we can assume $(-\alpha_i, \gamma_k) \leq 0$ for every i, k (resp. $(-\beta_j, \delta_l) \leq 0$ for every j, l). We will suppose $z + z' \geq 1$, the other case being similar.

Consider the equality:

$$\sum_{k=1}^r \gamma_k = \sum_{j=1}^s \beta_j + \sum_{l=1}^q \delta_l + \sum_{i=1}^t (-\alpha_i).$$

Since the product of any term of the left-hand side by any term of the right-hand side is smaller than 0, all of them must be zero; in particular, we have $\sum_{k=1}^r \gamma_k = 0$. Since we then obtain $s'z' \geq s''z(\Psi) \geq \sum_{k=1}^r \varepsilon_{\gamma_k}$, we may assume $r = 0$.

For any $z \in [z(\Psi''), z(\Psi)]$, according to the lemma 5.10 applied to Ψ'' and z , we have:

$$tz + (s + r)(1 - z) > c_0.$$

This is in particular true for $z = z(\Psi)$; we easily deduce from this that we have $tz + s(1 - z) + r(1 - z') > c_0$ for $z \leq z(\Psi) < z'$ and z and z' close enough to $z(\Psi)$, as required. $\square$

By the same argument as in the proof of the lemma 5.6, we only have to consider a finite number of families $((\alpha_i), (\beta_j), (\gamma_k), (\delta_l))$; there exist then z, z' such that the above lemma is true for z, z' and all such families. Hence $E(\Psi'', z) \cap E(\Psi', z')$ is nonempty; since $E(\Psi'', z)$ is obviously contained in $E(\Psi_0, z)$, we obtain the desired result.

We'll now turn on to the case when f_H is of type 2. This case actually occurs too: for example, take $G = SL_4$, and:

$$H = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \mathfrak{p} & \mathfrak{p} & \mathfrak{p} & \mathfrak{p} \\ \mathfrak{p} & 1 + \mathfrak{p} & \mathfrak{p} & \mathfrak{p} \\ \mathfrak{p}^2 & \mathfrak{p}^2 & 1 + \mathfrak{p}^2 & \mathfrak{p}^2 \\ \mathfrak{p}^2 & \mathfrak{p}^2 & \mathfrak{p}^2 & 1 + \mathfrak{p}^2 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

It is easy to check that this group is a normal subgroup of I . Moreover, we have $f_\varepsilon(-\alpha_1) = 0$ and $f_\varepsilon(\alpha_3) = 2$, hence f_H is of type 2.

Once again, h is not of the form $T'U_{x,r}$ for any T', x, r . Let Φ_0 be the subsystem of Φ whose elements are the linear combinations of elements α such that $f_\varepsilon(\alpha) = v'$; we have:

Proposition 6.9 *The root subsystem Φ_0 of Φ is of rank strictly smaller than the rank of Φ . Moreover, it admits a subset of Δ' as a set of simple roots.*

We'll show that if α, β are elements of Φ such that $f_\varepsilon(\alpha) = v'$ and $f_\varepsilon(\beta) = v' + 2$, α and β are strongly orthogonal; we'll then obtain the first assertion of the proposition the same way as in the proposition 6.6.

Assume $\alpha + \beta$ belongs to Φ . If $\alpha + \beta$ is greater than α and β , we have:

$$f_\varepsilon(\beta) \leq f_\varepsilon(\alpha + \beta) + 1 \leq f_\varepsilon(\alpha) + 1 = v' + 1,$$

which is impossible; the case $\alpha + \beta$ lesser than α and β is impossible too for similar reasons. Assume now $\alpha - \beta$ belongs to Φ ; we have $\beta = (\alpha - \beta) + \alpha$, hence $f_\varepsilon(\beta) \leq f_\varepsilon(\alpha) + 1$, which is again impossible. We then obtain that α and β are strongly orthogonal.

Moreover, if $f_\varepsilon(\alpha) = 0$, then $f_\varepsilon(\alpha') = 0$ for every $\alpha' \geq \alpha$; we then obtain that every element of Δ' occurring in the decomposition of $-\alpha$ belongs to Φ_0 , which shows the second assertion. $\square$

Consider the restriction of f_H to Φ_0 . The subset Φ_0 doesn't contain any α such that $f_\varepsilon(\alpha) = v' + 2$, since we have just seen such an α is strongly orthogonal to Φ_0 ; hence $f_H|_{\Phi_0}$ is of type 1. Moreover, let Δ'_0 be the extended basis of Φ_0 whose elements are the minimal elements of Φ_0 , and set $\Psi_0 = \Psi \cap \Phi_0$; Ψ_0 is obviously Δ'_0 -complete, and we have the following result:

Lemma 6.10 *We have $z'(\Psi_0) = 1$.*

Consider the extended basis Δ'_0 of Φ_0 ; this is the union of $\Delta_0 = \Delta' \cap \Phi_0$ with one additional element α , which is the inverse of the greatest root of Φ_0 w.r.t Δ_0 . Assume $f_H(-\alpha) = v'$; then for every $\beta \in \Phi$ such that $\beta \leq \alpha$, we must then have $f_H(-\beta) = v'$, hence $\beta \in \Phi_0$. By minimality of α in Φ_0 , we obtain that no such β exists, hence $\alpha \in \Delta'$, which leads to a contradiction. Therefore $\Phi_0 - \Psi_0$ doesn't contain the whole set $-\Delta'_0$, from which we deduce that $z'(\Psi_0) = 1$. $\square$

Since $z(\Psi_0) < 1$ by definition, we may define M, x and r the same way as in the case f_H of type 1 and $z(\Psi) = z'(\Psi)$; we obtain $r \in [v', v' + 1[$.

Moreover, let f'_H be the function on Φ defined by $f'_H(\alpha) = f_H(\alpha) + 1$ if $f_\varepsilon(\alpha) = 0$, and $f'_H(\alpha) = f_H(\alpha)$ if $f_\varepsilon(\alpha) > 0$; we have:

Lemma 6.11 *The group $U_{f'_H}$ is normal in I .*

Let α, β be elements of Φ such that $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$. Suppose that we have:

$$f'_H(\alpha + \beta) > f_I(\alpha) + f'_H(\beta).$$

This is possible only if we have $f_H(\alpha + \beta) = f_I(\alpha) + f_H(\beta)$, $f'_H(\alpha) = f_H(\alpha) - 1$ and $f'_H(\beta) = f_H(\beta)$. The first equality implies:

$$f_\varepsilon(\alpha + \beta) \geq f_\varepsilon(\beta).$$

Since $f_\varepsilon(\alpha + \beta) = 0$ and $f_\varepsilon(\beta) > 0$, this is impossible and the lemma is proved. $\square$

It is obvious from its definition that f'_H is of type 1. Moreover, let Ψ' be the Δ' -complete subset of Φ associated to f'_H ; the elements α of Δ' contained in Ψ' are exactly the ones such that $f_\varepsilon(\alpha) = 2$. Since, according to the proof of the proposition 6.9, the corresponding subset of Δ' is strongly orthogonal to some other nonempty subset of Φ , Ψ' cannot contain the whole set Δ' ; hence $z(\Psi') = 0$. Since $z'(\Psi') > 0$ by definition, we may define x' and r' as in the previous case too; we obtain here $r' \in [v' + 1, v' + 2[$.

We'll again conclude by proving that we may choose $x = x'$, or equivalently that $E_{\Psi_0, z} \cap E_{\Psi', z'}$ is nonempty for some z, z' . Let x be an element of $\mathcal{A}$ satisfying the following conditions:

- $x \in E_{\Psi_0, z}$ for some $z \geq z(\Psi_0)$, and $\alpha(x) > 0$ for every $\alpha \in \Delta' \cap \Psi_0$;
- $x \in E_{\Psi', z'}$ for some z' such that $z' < \alpha(x)$ for every $\alpha \in \Delta' \cap \Psi_0$.

The first condition is possible because $E_{\Psi_0, z}$ contains an open subset of $\mathcal{A}$, and the fact that Ψ_0 and Ψ' are strongly orthogonal to each other allows us to add the second one; we obtain that way $U_{x, r'} U_{M, x, r} \subset H \subset G_{x, r'} M_{x, r}$, as required.

We'll finally assume H is a normal subgroup of P , where P is any parahoric subgroup of G containing I . Since I normalizes H , H is either of the form $T' U_{x, r}$ for some T', x, r or of the form $T' U_{M, x, r} U_{x, r'}$ for some T', x, r, M, r' ; it only remains to show that we can choose x in $\overline{A_P}$.

Let P^+ be the pro-nilpotent radical of P ; let P_S be the unique parahoric subgroup of $S(F)$ and let P_S^+ be its pro-nilpotent radical. For every w in the Weyl group W_P of P/P^+ relatively to P_S/P_S^+ , w normalizes H ; hence H is equal to $w(T') U_{w(x), r}$ (resp. $w(T') U_{M, w(x), r} U_{w(x), r'}$). The subset B_H of $\overline{A_I}$ containing all elements x satisfying the condition of the theorem is then stable by W_P ; moreover, for any $x, x' \in B_H$ and every $t \in [0, 1]$, the element $(1 - t)x + tx'$ is well-defined in every apartment of $\mathcal{B}$ containing both x and x' , and we have:

$$B(x, r) \cap B(x', r) \subset B((1 - t)x + tx', r) \subset E(B(x, r), B(x', r)),$$

where $E(B(x, r), B(x', r))$ is the closure of $B(x, r) \cup B(x', r)$ in $\mathcal{B}$; hence $B((1 - t)x + tx', r)$ is fixed by H too. We deduce from this that B_H is a convex subset of $\overline{A_I}$; since W_P is finite, for any $x \in B_H$, the barycenter of the $w(x)$, $w \in W_P$, is both contained in B_H and fixed by W_P , hence contained in $\overline{A_P}$. This completes the proof of the theorem. $\square$

7 The general case

In this last section, we don't suppose G to be quasi-simple anymore. Let $\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_k$ be the connected components of Φ ; for every $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, let G_i be the subgroup of $G(F)$ generated by $T(F)$ and the $U_\alpha(F)$, $\alpha \in \Phi_i$. Let P be a parahoric subgroup containing P_T , and let H be a normal subgroup of P ; an immediate consequence of the proposition 1.1 is that we have:

$$H = \prod_{i=1}^k (H \cap G_i).$$

For every i , let $\mathcal{B}_i$ be the Bruhat-Tits building of G_i , and let $\mathcal{A}_i$ be the apartment of $\mathcal{B}_i$ associated to $S(F)$; it is easy to check that $\mathcal{A}$ is canonically isomorphic to $\prod_{i=1}^k \mathcal{A}_i$. Moreover, let A_P be the facet of $\mathcal{A}$ attached to P ; A_P is canonically isomorphic to $\prod_{i=1}^k A_{P_i}$, where for every i , A_{P_i} is the facet of $\mathcal{A}_i$ attached to $P_i = P \cap G_i$.

Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ be an element of $\mathcal{A}$, and let $r_1, \dots, r_k$ be nonnegative real numbers; we'll set:

$$G_{x, (r_1, \dots, r_k)} = \prod_{i=1}^k (G_i)_{x_i, r_i},$$

where for every i , $(G_i)_{x_i, r_i}$ is the standard filtration subgroup of G_i attached to x_i and r_i . If x belongs to A_P , $G_{x, (r_1, \dots, r_k)}$ is obviously normal in P . We'll define U_{x_i, r_i} and $U_{x, (r_1, \dots, r_k)}$ in a similar fashion.

According to theorem 1.2, for every i , there exists $x_i \in \overline{A_{P_i}}$ and $r_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $H \cap G_i$ satisfies one of the following conditions:

- $U_{x_i, r_i} \subset H \cap G_i \subset (G_i)_{x_i, r_i}$;
- there exists $r'_i > r_i$ and a proper Levi subgroup M_i of G_i containing $T(F)$ and such that $U_{x_i, r'_i} U_{M_i, x_i, r_i} \subset H \cap G_i \subset (G_i)_{x_i, r'_i} (M_i)_{x_i, r_i}$.

(Note that $r_1, \dots, r_k$ are not related in any way, and can be completely different from each other.)

For every i such that U_{x_i, r_i} is of the first kind, set $M_i = G_i$ and $r'_i = r_i$. Set $M = \prod_{i=1}^k M_i$, and $U_{M, x, (r_1, \dots, r_k)} = \prod_{i=1}^k U_{M_i, x_i, r_i}$; we deduce from above the following generalization of the theorem 1.2:

Theorem 7.1 *Assume the conditions of the proposition 1.1 are satisfied. There exists $x \in \overline{A_P}$ and $r_1, \dots, r_k \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ such that H satisfies one of the following*

conditions:

- $U_{x,(r_1,\dots,r_k)} \subset H \subset G_{x,(r_1,\dots,r_k)}$;
- *there exist $r'_1, \dots, r'_k$ such that $r'_i \geq r_i$ for every i and $r'_i > r_i$ for at least one i , and a proper Levi subgroup M of G containing T , such that $U_{x,(r'_1,\dots,r'_k)} U_{M,x,(r_1,\dots,r_k)} \subset H \subset G_{x,(r'_1,\dots,r'_k)} M_{x,(r_1,\dots,r_k)}$.*

References

- [1] N. Bourbaki, Groupes et algèbres de Lie, chapitre 6: Systèmes de racines, Hermann.
- [2] F. Bruhat, J. Tits, Groupes réductifs sur un corps local, Publications Mathématiques de l'IHES, vol. 41 (1972), pp. 5-251 (I), and vol 60 (1984), pp. 5-184 (II).
- [3] C. Chevalley, Sur certains groupes simples, Tohoku Math. Journal, vol 7 (2), 1955, pp. 14-66.
- [4] J.C. Jantzen, Representations of Algebraic Groups, Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 131, 1987.
- [5] A. Moy, G. Prasad, Unrefined minimal K-types for p-adic groups, Inventiones mathematicae, vol. 116 (1994), pp. 393-408.
- [6] A. Moy, G. Prasad, Jacquet factors and unrefined minimal K-types for p-adic groups, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici, vol. 71 (1996), pp. 98-121.
- [7] G. Prasad, M.S. Raghunathan, Topological central extensions of semi-simple groups over local fields (I and II), Annals of Mathematics, vol. 119 (1984), pp. 143-268.
- [8] T.A. Springer, Linear algebraic groups, Progress in Mathematics, Birkhäuser, vol 9, 2001 (2nd edition).
- [9] R. Steinberg, Lectures on Chevalley groups, Yale University, 1967.